

11-20h

THE
ERRATA
TO THE
Protestant Bible,
OR, THE
TRUTH
OF THEIR
English Translations Examined,

In a Treatise shewing some of the Errors that are to be found in the *Protestant English* Translations of the Sacred SCRIPTURE, against such Points of Catholick Doctrine as are in Debate between Them and the Church of ROME.

In which also, from their Mis-translating the Twenty Third Verse of the Fourteenth Chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles*, the Consecration of Dr. Matthew Parker, the First Protestant Arch-Bishop of CANTERBURY, is Occasionally Consider'd.

By T. Ward

Apocalyps, cap. 22. ver. 18, 19.

Contestor enim omni audienti verba Prophetiae libri huius: Si quis apposuerit ad haec apponet Deus super illum plagas Scriptas in libro isto. Et si quis diminuerit de verbis libri Prophetiae huius, auferet Deus partem ejus de Libro vitae, & de Civitate Sancta, & de his quae Scripta sunt in libro isto.

With Allowance.

LONDON, Printed for the Author, And Sold by most Booksellers. 1688.



904
2

THE PREFACE.



Among the many and irreconcilable Differences between Roman Catholics, and the Sectaries of our days, Those about the Holy Scriptures claim not the least place on the Stage of Controversie: As, First, Whether the Bible is the Sole and only Rule of Faith? Secondly, Whether all things necessary to Salvation, are contain'd in the Bible? Or, Whether we are bound to believe some things, as absolutely necessary to Salvation, which are either not clear in Scripture, or not evidently deduc'd out of Scripture? Thirdly, Whether every individual Person, of sound Judgment, ought to follow his own private Interpretation of the Scripture? If so, Why one Party or Profession should Condemn, Persecute, and Penal-Law Another, for being of that Perswasion he finds most agreeable to the Scripture, as expounded according to his own Private Spirit? If not, To what Interpreter ought they to submit themselves, and on whom may they safely and securely depend, touching the Exposition and true Sense and Meaning of the same? Fourthly, Whence we have the Scripture? that is, who handed it down to Us from the Apostles, that Writ it? And by what Authority we receive it for the Word of God? And, Whether we ought not to receive the Sence and true Meaning of the Scripture, upon the same Authority we receive the Letter? For if Protestants think, the Letter was safe in the Custody of the Roman Catholick Church, from which they receiv'd it, How can they suspect the Purity of that Sence, which was kept and delivered to them by the same Church and Authority? With several other such like Queries, frequently proposed by Catholics; and never yet, nor ever like to be, solidly Answer'd by any Sectaries what-ever.

'Tis not the Design of this following Treatise to enter into these Disputes; But only to shew Thee (Christian Reader) that those Translations of the Bible, which the English Protestant Clergy have made and presented to the People, for Their Only Rule of Faith, are in many places not only Partial, but False, and disfigured with several Corruptions, Abuses and Falsifications, in Derogation to the most material Points of Catholick Doctrine, and in Favour and Advantage of their own Erroneous Opinions: For,

As it has been the Custom of Hereticks in all Ages, to pretend to Scripture Alone for their Rule, and to reject the Authority of Gods Holy Church; so has it also ever been their Practice to Falsify, Corrupt, and Abuse the same in divers manners.

1. One way is, To deny whole Books thereof, or parts of Books, when they are evidently against them; so did (for Example) Ebion all St. Pauls Epistles; Manicheus the Acts of the Apostles; Luther likewise deny'd three of the four Gospels, saying, That St. John's is the only true Gospel; and so do our English Protestants those Books which they call Apocrypha.

2. Another way is, To call in question at the least, and make some doubt of the Authority of certain Books of Holy Scriptures, thereby to diminish their Credit; So did Manicheus affirm, That the whole New Testament was not writ by the Apostles, and peculiarly St. Matthews Gospel: So does Luther discredit the Epistle of St. James: So did Marcion and the Arians deny the Epistle to the Hebrews to be St. Pauls, in which they were follow'd

The P R E F A C E.

See Bible
1579, 1085

by our first English Protestant Translators of the Bible, who presum'd to strike St. Paul's Name out of the very Title of the said Epistle.

3. Another way is, To expound the Scripture according to their own private Spirit, and to reject the approved Sense of the Holy Antient Fathers, and Catholick Church: So do all Hereticks, who seem to ground their Errors upon the Scriptures; especially those, who will have Scripture, as by themselves Expounded, for their Only Rule of Faith.

4. Another way is, To alter the very Original Text of the Holy Scriptures, by Adding, Diminishing, or Changing it here and there for their purpose: So did the Arians, Nestorians, &c. and also Marcion; who is therefore call'd Mus Ponticus, from his gnawing (as it were) certain places with his Corruptions; and for the same reason may Beza not improperly be call'd the Mouse of Geneva.

5. Another way (not unlike to this) is, To make Corrupt and False Translations of the Scriptures for the Maintenance of their Errors: So did the Arians and Pelagians of old, and so have done the pretended Reformers of our days, which I intend to make the Subject of this following Treatise.

Yet, before I proceed any further, let me first assure my Reader, That this Work is not undertaken on any design of lessening the Credit or Authority of the Holy Bible, as perhaps some may be ready to surmise: For indeed, 'tis a common Exclamation among our Adversaries, (especially such of them as one would think should have a greater respect for Truth) That Catholicks set light by the written word of God: That they undervalue and contemn the Sacred Scriptures: That they endeavour to lessen the Credit and Authority of the Holy Bible. Thus possessing the poor deluded people with an Ill opinion of Catholicks, as if they rejected, and trod under feet, the Written Word: Whereas 'tis evident to all, who know them, That none can have a greater Respect and Veneration for the Holy Scripture, than Catholicks have, Receiving, Reverencing, and Honouring the same, as the very Pure and True Word of God; neither rejecting, nor so much as doubting of the least tittle in the Bible, from the beginning of Genesis, to the end of the Apocalyps; several devout Catholicks having that profound Veneration for it, that they always Read it kneeling on their Knees, with the greatest Humility and Reverence imaginable, not enduring to see it Profan'd in any kind; nor so much as to see the least torn leaf of a Bible put to any manner of unseemly use. Those who, besides all this, consider with what very indifferent behaviour the Scripture is ordinarily handled among Protestants, will not, I am confident, say, that Catholicks have a less regard for it, than Protestants have; but, on the contrary, a far greater.

Again, dear Reader, If thou find'st in any part of this Treatise, that the Nature of the Subject has Extorted from me such Expressions, as may perhaps seem either spoken with too much heat, or not altogether so soft, as might be wisht for; yet, let me desire thee, not to look upon them as the dictates of Passion, but rather as the just resentments of a Zealous Mind, mov'd with the Incentive of seeing Gods Sacred Word adulterated and corrupted by Ill designing Men, on purpose to delude and deceive the ignorant and unwary Reader.

The Holy Scriptures were Written by the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists; The Old Testament in Hebrew, (except only some few parts in Chaldee and Syriack;) The greatest part of the New Testament, was writ in Greek, St. Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew, and St. Mark's in Latin. We have not at this day the Original Writings of these Prophets and Apostles, nor of the 70. Interpreters, who Translated the Old Testament into Greek about 300 years before the coming of Christ; We have only Copies; for the Truth and Exactness whereof, we must rely upon the Testimony and Tradition of the Church, which in so Important a point God would never permit to Err: So that we have not the least doubt, but the Copy,

Authori-

The P R E F A C E.

Authorized and Approved on by the Church, is sufficiently Authentick; for what avails it for a Christian to Believe, that Scripture is the Word of God, if he be uncertain which Copy and Translation is True? Yet, notwithstanding the necessity of admitting Some true Authentick Copy, Protestants pretend that there is None Authentick in the World, as may be seen in the Preface of the Tigurine Edition of the Bible, and in all their Books of Controversie; seeing therein they condemn the Council of Trent, for declaring that the Old Translation is Authentick, and yet themselves name no other for such: And therefore, tho' the Lutherans fancy Luther's Translation; The Calvinists that of Geneva; The Zuinglians that of Zuinglius; The English, sometimes one, and sometimes another: Yet because they do not hold any One to be Authentick, it follows (from their Exceptions against the Infallibility of the Roman-Catholick-Church in Declaring or Decreeing a True and Authentick Copy of Scripture, and their Confession of the uncertainty of their own Translations) That they have no certainty of Scripture at all, nor even of FAITH, which they ground upon Scripture Alone.

That the Vulgata of the Latin is the most True and Authentick Copy, has been the Judgment of Gods Church for above this 1300 Years; during which time, the Church has always us'd it; and therefore it is by the Sacred Council † of Trent declar'd Authentick and Canonical in every part and Book thereof.

*Most of the Old Testament, as it is in the said Latin Vulgata, was Translated * out of Hebrew by St. Hierom; And the New Testament had been before his time Translated out of Greek, but was by him † Review'd; and such Faults as had crept in by the negligence of the Transcribers, were Corrected by him at the Appointment of Pope Damasus. You constrain me (says he) to make a New work of an Old, that I (after so many Copies of the Scriptures) dispers'd through the World, should sit as a certain Judge, which of them agree with the true Greek. ---- I have restor'd the New Testament to the Truth of the Greek, and have Translated the Old according to the Hebrew. --- Truly, I will affirm it confidently, and will produce many Witnesses of this Work, that I have chang'd nothing from the Truth of the Hebrew, &c.*

And for sufficient Testimony of the Sincerity of the Translator, and Commendations of his Translation, read these Words of the Great Doctor St. Augustin: --- There was not wanting (says he) in these our days, Hierom the Priest, a Man most Learned and Skillful in all the Three Tongues; who not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew, Translated the same Scriptures into Latin, whose Learned Labour the Jews yet confess to be true:

Tea, the Truth and Purity of this Translation is such, That even the bitterest of Protestants themselves are forc't to Confess it to be the best, and to prefer it before all others, as also to acknowledge the Learning, Piety, and Sincerity of the Translator of it; Which Mr. Whittaker (notwithstanding his Railing in another place) does in these Words. --- St. Hierom, I Reverence; Damasus, I Commend; and the Work I confess to be Godly and profitable to the Church.

Dr. Dove says thus of it; --- We grant it fit, that for Uniformity in quotations of Places, in Schools and Pulpits, one Latin Text should be us'd: And we can be contented, for the Antiquity thereof, to prefer that [The Vulgata] before all other Latin Books.

And for the Antiquity of it, Dr. Covel tells us, That it was us'd in the Church 1300. years ago: Not doubting but to Prefer that Translation before others.

Dr. Humphrey frees St. Hierom, both from Malice and Ignorance in Translating, in these words. --- The Old Interpreter was much addicted to the Propriety of the Words, and indeed with too much Anxiety, which I attribute to Religion, not to Ignorance.

In regard of which Integrity and Learning, Molinæus signifies his good esteem thereof,

† Conc. Trident. Sess. 4.
* St. Hierom
in lib. de viris
Illustr. extremis;
& in Praefat. librorum
quos Latinos
fecit.

† Hier. Ep. 89.
ad Aug. quæst.
11. inter Ep.
Aug.

See his Preface
before the
New Testament,
dedicated to Pope
Damasus and
his Catalogue
in fine.

St. Aug. de
Civit. Dei
lib. 18. c. 43.
& ep. 80. ad
Hierom c. 3.
& lib. 22. Doct.
Christi, c. 15.

Whittaker in
his Answer to
Reynolds,
pag. 241.

Dove, Persuasion
to Recusants,
pag. 16.

See Dr. Covel
Answer to
Burgess, p. 91.
94.

Dr. Hum.
de Ratione
interp. lib. 1.
pag. 71.

The P R E F A C E.

Molin. in
Nov. Test.
Part. 30.
† *Et in Luc.*
17.

Pellican in
Præfat. in
Psalter Anno
1584.

Beza in
Annot. in
Luc. 1. 1.
Et in Præ-
fat. Nov. Test.
† *S. Hieron*
& *St. Aug.*
Supr.

S. Greg.
lib. 70. Mor.
c. 23. *Isidor.*
lib. 6. Etym.
c. 5. 7. & de
Divin. Offic.
l. 1. c. 12.
S. Beda in
Martyrol.
Cassiod. 21.
Infr. &c.

Object.

Ans. w.

† *2 Chron.*
28. ver. 19.

4 *Kings* 14.
ver. 17. 19.

Humpb. lib. 1.
de rar. interp.
pag. 178.

saying, ---- I cannot easily forsake the vulgar and accustom'd Reading, which also I am accustom'd earnestly to defend: Yea, † I prefer the *Vulgar Edition*, before *Erasmus*, *Bucer*, *Bullinger*, *Brentius*, the *Tigurine Translation*; yea, before *John Calvin's*, and all others: *How Honourably he speaks of it! And yet,*

Conradus Pellican, (a Man commended by Bucer, Zuinglius, Melancthon, and all the famous Protestants about Basil, Tigre, Berne, &c.) gives it a far higher Commendation, in these Words: ---- I find the Vulgar Edition of the Psalter to agree for the Sence, with such Dexterity, Learning, and Fidelity of the Hebrew, that I doubt not, but the Greek and Latin Interpreter was a Man most Learned, most Godly, and of a Prophetical Spirit. Which certainly are the best Properties of a Good Translator.

In fine, Even Beza himself, one of the Greatest of our Adversaries, affords this Honourable Testimony of our Vulgar Translation: ---- I confess, (says he) that the Old Interpreter seems to have Interpreted the Holy Books with wonderful Sincerity and Religion. The Vulgar Edition I do, for the most part, Embrace and Prefer before all others.

You see, how highly our Vulgata in Latin is commended by these Learned Protestants: See likewise, how it has been esteem'd by the Antient † Fathers: Yet notwithstanding all this is not sufficient to move Protestants to accept or acquiesce in it; and doubtless the very reason is, because they would have as much liberty to reject the True Letter, as the True Sence of Scripture, their New Doctrines being condemn'd by both. For had they allow'd any one Translation to have been Authentick, they certainly could never have had the Impudence so wickedly to have Corrupted it, by Adding, Omitting, and Changing, which they could never have pretended the least excuse for, in any Copy by themselves held for True and Authentick.

But however, their greatest Objection against the Vulgata Latin is, That we ought rather to have recourse to the Original Languages, the Fountains of the Hebrew and Greek, in which the Scriptures were written by the Prophets and Apostles, who could not Err; than to stand to the Latin Translations, made by divers Interpreters, who might Err.

Ans. w. When 'tis certain, that the Originals or Fountains are Pure, and not Troubled or Corrupt, they are to be prefer'd before Translations: But 'tis most certain, that they are corrupted in divers places, as Protestants themselves are forc'd to acknowledge, and as it appears by their own Translations; For Example, Psal. 22. ver. 16. they Translate, They pierc'd my Hands and my Feet: Whereas, according to the Hebrew that now is, It must be read, — As a Lyon, my Hands, and my Feet; which no doubt, is not only Nonsense, but an Intollerable Corruption of the latter Jews against the Passion of our Saviour, of which the Old Authentick Hebrew was a most remarkable Prophecie. Again, according to the Hebrew, it is read, † Achaz, King of Israel; which being false, they in some of their first Translations read, Achaz, King of Juda, according to the Truth, and as it is the Greek and Vulgar Latin; Yet their Bible 1579, as also their last Translation, had rather follow the falshood of the Hebrew against their own knowledge, than to be thought beholden to the Greek or Latin in so light a matter. Likewise, where the Hebrew says, Zedecias [Joachin's] Brother, they are forc'd to Translate Zedecias his Fathers Brother, as indeed the Truth is, according to the Greek. So likewise in another place, where the Hebrew is, He begat Azuba his Wife and Jerioth; which they not easily knowing what to make of, Translate in some of their Bibles, He begat Azuba of his Wife Jerioth; and in others, He begat Jerioth of his Wife Azuba. But without multiplying Examples, 'tis sufficiently known to Protestants, and by them acknowledg'd, how intollerably the Hebrew Fountains and Originals are by the Jews corrupted: Amongst others, Dr. Humphry says, The Jewish Superstition, how many places it has corrupted, the Reader may easily find out and Judge.

And

The P R E F A C E.

And in another place; I look not, says he, that Men should too much follow the Rab- bins, as many do; for those places, which promise and declare Christ the true Messias, are most filthily deprav'd by them.

The Old Interpreter (says another Protestant) seems to have read one way, whereas the Jews now read another; which I say, because I would not have men think this to have proceeded from the Ignorance or Slothfulness of the Old Interpreter: Rather we have cause to find fault for want of Diligence in the Antiquaries, and Faith in the Jews; who, both before Christ's coming and since, seem to be less careful of the Psalms, than of their Talmudical Songs.

I would gladly know of our Protestant Translators of the Bible, what reason they have to think the Hebrew Fountain (they boast of) so Pure and Uncorrupt, seeing not only Letters and Syllables have been mistaken, Texts deprav'd, but even whole Books of the Prophets utterly lost and Perish'd? How many Books of the Antient Prophets, sometime Extant, are not now to be found? We read in the Old Testament, of a Liber Bellorum Domini, The Book of the Wars of our Lord; The Book of the Just Men, [Protestants call it the Book of Jasher.] The Book of Jehu the Son of Hanani; The Books of Semeias the Prophet, and of Addo the Seer: And Samuel wrote in a Book the Law of the Kingdom, (how Kings ought to Rule,) and laid it up before our Lord: And the Works of Solomon were Written in the Book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the Books of Ahias the Shilonite, and in the Vision of Addo the Seer: With several others, which are all quite perisht; Tea, and perished in such a time, when the Jews were the pecu- liar People of God, and when, of all Nations, they were to God a holy Nation, a Kingly Priesthood: And now, when they are no National People, have no Government, no King, no Priest, but are Vagabonds upon the Earth, and scatter'd among all People; may we reasonably think their Divine and Ecclesiastical Books to have been so warily and carefully kept, that all and every part is safe, pure, and incorrupt; that every parcel is sound, no points, tittles, or letters lost, or misplac'd, but all sincere, perfect, and absolute?

How easie it is, in Hebrew Letters, to mistake sometimes one for another, and so to alter the whole sence? As for Example, This very Letter [vau] for [jod] has certainly made disagreement in some places; as where the Septuagint read, $\pi \kappa \epsilon \tau \theta \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon \varsigma \sigma \iota \phi \iota \lambda \alpha \delta \epsilon \omega$, Fortitudinem meam ad te custodiam, My Strength I will keep to thee; which Reading St. Hierom also follow'd: It is now in the Hebrew [וַיְכָחֶשְׁ] fortitudinem ejus, His Strength I will keep to thee: Which Corruptions our last Protestant Translators follow, Reading, Because of his Strength will I wait upon thee; and to make Sence on't, they add the words [because of,] and change the word [keep to] into [wait upon,] to the great perverting of the Sence and Sentence. A like Error is that in Gen. 3. (If it be an Error, as many very probably think 'tis none,) Ipsa conteret caput tuum, for Ipse or Ipsum, about which Protestants keep such a Clamour.

As the Hebrew has been by the Jews abus'd and falsify'd against our Blessed Saviour Christ Jesus, especially in such places as were manifest Prophecies of his Death and Passion: So likewise has the Greek Fountain been Corrupted by the Eastern Hereticks, against divers points of Christian Doctrine; insomuch that Protestants themselves, who pretend so great Veneration for it, dare not follow it in many places; but are forc't to fly to our Vulgar Latin, as is observed in the Preface to the Rhemish Testament; where also you may find sufficient Reasons, why our Catholick Bible is Translated into English rather from the Vul- gata Latin, than from the Greek.

To pass by several Examples of Corruptions in the Greek Copy, which might be produc'd, I will only, amongst many, take notice of these two following rash and inconsiderate Additions:

C

First,

Lib. 2.
Pag. 219.

Conrad. Pell.
Tom. 4. in.
Psal. 85. v. 9.

Numb.
21. ver. 14.
Josh. 10.
v. 13. 2 Kings
1. ver. 18.
2 Paral
ver. 34.
12. v. 15.
1 King. 10.
ver. 25.
2 Paral.
9. ver. 29.

Psal. 58. v. 10.
in Procr. Bible,
it is Psal. 59.
ver. 9.

Gen. 3. v. 15.
נִכְרִית
נִכְרִית

The P R E F A C E.

ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ
καὶ τοῦ
καὶ τοῦ

Beza in Joh.
cap. 8. ver. 59.

First, Joh. 8. ver. 59. after these words, *Exiit ē Templo, Went out of the Temple;* are added, *Transiens per medium eorum, Sic præterit;* Going through the midst of them, and so passed by. Touching which Addition, Beza writes thus; These words are found in very Antient Copies; but I think, as does *Erasmus*, that the first part, [*Going through the midst of them*] is taken out of *Luk. 4. ver. 30.* and crept into the Text by fault of the Writers, who found that written in the Margent: And that the latter part [*and so passed by*] was added to make this Chapter joyn well with the next. And I am mov'd thus to think, not only because neither *Chrysostom*, nor *Augustin*, (he might have said, nor *Hierom*) make any mention of this Piece; but also, because it seems not to hang together very probably; for, if he withdrew himself out of their sight, how went he through the midst of them? &c. Thus Beza disputes against it; for which cause (I suppose) it is omitted by our English first Translators, who love to follow what their Master Beza delivers them in Latin, though forsooth they would have us think, they follow'd the Greek most precisely; for in their Translations of the Year 1561, 1562, 1577, 1579, they leave it out, as Beza does: Yet in their Testament of 1580, as also in this last Translation, (Bib. 1683.) they put it in, with as much confidence as if it had neither been disputed against by Beza, nor omitted by their former Brethren.

Erasmus in
Annot.
Bullinger
Decade. 5.
Serm. 5.

To this we may also joyn that piece which Protestants so gloriously Sing and Say at the end of the Lord's Prayer, [For thine is the Kingdom, the Power and Glory, for ever and ever, Amen,] which not only Erasmus dislikes, but Bullinger himself holds it for a meer Patch Sow'd to the rest, by he knows not whom: And allows well of Erasmus's Judgment, reproving Laurentius Valla for finding fault with the Latin Edition, because it wants it: --- There is no reason (says he) why Laurentius Valla should take the matter so hotly, as though a great part of the Lords Prayer were cut away: rather their rashness was to be reprov'd, who durst presume to piece on their Toys unto the Lord's Prayer.

Beza in Praef.
Nov. Test.
Anno 1556.

Let not my Reader think, that our Latin Vulgata differs from the true and most Authentick Greek Copies, which were extant in St. Hierom's days, but only from such as are now Extant, and since his days Corrupted. How unworthily (says Beza) and without Cause, does Erasmus blame the Old Interpreter, as dissenting from the Greek? He dissented, I grant, from those Greek Copies which Erasmus had gotten; but we have not found in one place, that the same Interpretation which he blames, is grounded on the Authority of other Greek Copies, and those most Antient: Yea, in some number of places we have observ'd, that the Reading of the Latin Text of the Old Interpreter, though it agree sometime with our Greek Copies, yet it is much more convenient, for that it seems to follow some truer and better Copy.

See the Praef.
to the Rhem.
Test.
Dr. Martin's
Discovery.
Reynolds's
Resurrection of
Whitaker,
cap. 13.

Now, if our Latin Vulgata be fram'd exactly, though not to the Vulgar Greek Examples now Extant, yet to more Antient and perfect Copies; If the Greek Copies have many Faults, Errors, Corruptions, and Additions in them, as not only Beza avouches, but as our Protestant Translators Confess, and as evidently appears by their leaving the Greek, and following the Latin: With what Reason can they thus cry up the Fountains and Originals, as incorrupted and pure? With what Honesty can they call us from our Antient Vulgar Latin, to the present Greek, from which themselves so licenciously depart at pleasure, to follow our Latin?

Have we not great reason to think, that as the Latin Church has been ever more constant in keeping the true Faith, than the Greek; so it has always been more careful in preserving the Scriptures from Corruption.

Let Protestants only consider, whether it be more Credible that St. Hierom, one of the greatest Doctors of God's Church, and the most skilful in the Languages wherein the Scripture

The PREFACE.

Scripture was Written, who liv'd in the Primitive times, when perhaps some of the Original Writings of the Apostles were Extant, or at least the True and Authentick Copies in Hebrew and Greek better known than now they are: Let us then consider, (I say) whether is more Credible, that a Translation made or receiv'd by this Holy Doctor, (and then approv'd of by all the World, and ever since accepted and applauded in God's Church) should be Defective, False, or Deceitful: or, That a Translation made since the pretended Reformation, not only by Men of Scandalous, and Notorious Wicked Lives, but from Copies corrupted by Jews, Arians, and other Greek Hereticks, should be so?

Such were
Luther, Cal-
vin, Beza,
Bucer, Cran-
mer, Tindale,
&c.

In vain therefore do Protestants tell us, That their Translations are taken immediately from the Fountains of the Greek and Hebrew; So is also our Latin Vulgata; only with this difference, That Ours was taken from the Fountains when they were Clear, and by Holy and Learned Men, who knew which were the Chrystal Waters, and True Copies; But Theirs is taken from Fountains troubled by broachers of Heresies, Self-Interested, and Time-Serving Persons; And after that the Arians, and other Hereticks had (I say) Corrupted and Poyson'd them with their false and abominable Doctrines.

Chemnitius and others yet further Object, That there are some Corruptions found in the Vulgar Latin, viz. That these Words, [Ipsa conteret Caput tuum] are Corrupted, thereby to prove the Intercession of the Blessed Virgin Mary; and that instead thereof, we should read, Ipsum Conteret Caput tuum, seeing it was spoken of the Seed which was Christ, as all Antient Writers Teach.

Object. 1.

Gen. 3.

* St. August.

lib. 2. de Gen.

cont. Manich.

c. 18. l. 11. de

Gen. ad Lite-

ram cap. 36.

S. Amb. lib.

de Fuga Sa-

culi, cap. 7.

S. Chrysost. in

Hom. 17. in

Gen.

S. Greg. lib. 1.

Mor. cap. 38.

Beza, & alii

in hunc lo-

cum.

Answ. Some Books of the Vulgar Edition, have [Ipsa,] and some others [Ipse,] and though many Hebrew Copies have Ipse, yet there want not some which have Ipsa; and the Points being taken away, the Hebrew word may be Translated Ipsa: Tea, the Holy Fathers, † St. Augustin, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Gregory, St. Bede, &c. read it [Ipsa,] and I think we have as great reason to follow their Interpretation of it, as Chemnitius's, or the Protestants of our days: And though the word (Conteret) in the Hebrew, be of the Masculine Gender, and so should relate to Semen, which also in the Hebrew, is of the Masculine Gender; yet 'tis not rare in the Scriptures to have Pronouns and Verbs of the Masculine Gender, joyn'd with Nouns of the Feminine, as in Ruth 1. 8. Esther 1. 20. Eccles. 12. 5. The rest of Chemnitius's Cavils you'll find sufficiently Answered by the Learned Cardinal Bellarmine, Lib. 2. de verb. Dei, cap. 12. 13, 14.

Again, Mr. Whittaker Condemns us for following our Latin Vulgata so precisely, as thereby to omit these words, (When this Corruptible, shall have put on Incorruption) which are in the Greek Exemplars, but not in our Vulgar Latin: Whence it follows assuredly, (says he) that Hierom dealt not faithfully here, or that his Version was corrupted afterwards.

1 Cor. c. 15.

v. 54.

I Answer to this, (with Dr. Reynolds) That this Omission (if it be any,) could not proceed of Malice or Design, seeing there is no loss or hindrance to any part of Doctrine, by Reading as we Read; for the self-same thing is most clearly set down in the very next lines before, thus stands the Words: For this Corruptible, must do on Incorruption; and this Mortal, do on Immortality: And when this (Corruptible, has done on Incorruption, and this) Mortal has done on Immortality. Where you see the Words, which I have put down, inclosed within the Parenthesis, () are contain'd most expressly in the foregoing Sentence, which is in all our Testaments; so that there is no harm or danger either to Faith, Doctrine, or Manners, if it be omitted.

See Dr. Rey-

nolds's

Refutation of

Whittaker's

Reprehen-

sions, cap. 13.

That it was of Old in some Greek Copies, as it stands in our Vulgar Latin, is evident by St. Hierom's Translating of it thus: And why ought St. Hierom to be suspected of unfaithful dealing, seeing he put the self-same Words and Sense in the next lines immediately

preced-

The P R E F A C E.

S. Bede in
1 Cor. c. 15.

preceding? And that it was not Corrupted since, appears by the common Reading of most Men, in all after-Ages. St. Ambrose in his Commentary upon the same place, reads as we do. So does St. Augustin, De Civitate Dei, cited by St. Bede, in his Commentary upon the same Chapter. So read also the rest of the Catholick Interpreters, Haymo, Anselm, &c.

But if this place be rightly consider'd, so far it is from appearing, as done with any design of corrupting the Text, that on the contrary, it apparently shews the sincerity of our Latin Translation: For, as we keep our Text, according as St. Hierom and the Church then deliver'd it; so notwithstanding, because the said words are in the Antient Greek Copies, we generally add them in the Margent of every Latin Testament, which the Church uses, as may be seen in divers Prints of Paris, Lovain, and other Universities: And if there be any fault in our English Translation, 'tis only that this Particle was not put down in the Margent, as it was in the Latin, which we follow'd. So that this, I say, proves no Corruption, but rather great Fidelity in our Latin Testament, that it agrees with St. Hierom, and consequently with the Greek Copies, which he Interpreted, as with St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Bede, Haymo, and St. Anselm.

Whether these vain and frivolous Objections are sufficient grounds for their Rejecting our Vulgar Latin, and flying to the Original (but now impure) Fountains, I refer to the Judicious Reader.

But now, how Clear, Limpid, and Pure, the Streams are, that flow from the Greek and Hebrew Fountains, through the Channels of Protestant Pens, the Reader may easily guess (without taking the pains of comparing them) from the Testimonies they themselves bear of one anothers Translations.

Zuing. Tom.
2. ad Luth.
lib. de S.

Zuinglius writes thus to Luther, concerning his Corrupt Translation; Thou corruptest the Word of God, (O Luther;) Thou art seen to be a manifest and common Corrupter and Perverter of the Holy Scripture; How much are we ashamed of thee, who have hitherto esteem'd thee beyond all Measure, and now prove thee to be such a Man?

Keckerman.
Syst. 8. Theol.
lib. 2. p. 188.
1 St. Job. 5, 7.

Luther's Dutch Translation of the Old Testament, especially of Job and the Prophets, has its Blemishes, says Keckerman, and those no small ones. Neither are the Blemishes in his New Testament to be accounted small ones; One of which is, his omitting and wholly leaving out this Text in St. John's Epistle; (There be Three who give Testimony in Heaven; The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One.)

To. 5. Germ.
fol. 142, 144.

— Again, in Rom. 3. 28. He adds the word (ALONE) to the Text, saying, We account a Man to be Justify'd by Faith ALONE, without the Works of the Law. Of which Intolerable Corruption being Admonish'd, he persisted Obstinate and Wilful, saying, So I Will, so I Command; let my Will be instead of Reason, &c. Luther will have it so: And at last thus concludes, The Word (ALONE) must remain in my New Testament, altho' all the Papists run Mad, they shall not take it from thence: It grieves me, that I did not add also those two other Words, OMNIBUS & OMNIUM, sine Omnibus Operibus, Omnium Legum; Without (All) Works of (All) Laws.

* See Zuing.
Tom. 2. ad
Luth. lib. de
Sacr. fol. 388,
389.

Again, in requital to Zuinglius, Luther rejects the Zuinglian Translation, terming them in matter of Divinity, Fools, Asses, Anti-christs, Deceivers, &c. and indeed, not without Cause; for what could be more Deceitful and Anti-christian, than instead of our Saviour's Words, (This is my Body,) to Translate, This signifies my Body, as Zuinglius did, to maintain his Figurative signification of the Words, and cry down Christ's Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament?

* Hosp. Hist.
Sacram. part.
ult. fol. 183.
Lavath. Hist.
Sacram. l. 32.

When Froscheverus, the Zuinglian Printer of Zurick, sent Luther a Bible Translated by the Divines there; He would not receive it; but, as * Hospinian, and Lavatherus witness, sent it back, and rejected it.

The

The P R E F A C E.

The Tigrine Translation was in like manner so distastful to other Protestants, That the Elector of Saxony in great Anger rejected it, and plac'd Luther's Translation in Room thereof.

Beza reproves the Translation set forth by Oecolampadius, and the Divines of Basil; affirming, That the Basil Translation is in many places wicked, and altogether differing from the Mind of the Holy Ghost.

Castalio's Translation is also Condemn'd by * Beza, as being Sacrilegious, Wicked, and Ethnical; insomuch that Castalio Writ a special Treatise in Defence of it: In the Preface of which he thus Complains, — Some reject our Latin and French Translations of the Bible, not only as Unlearned, but also as Wicked, and differing in many places from the Mind of the Holy Ghost.

That Learned Protestant, † Molinæus, affirms of Calvin's Translation, That Calvin in his Harmony, makes the Text of the Gospel to leap up and down; He uses Violence to the Letter of the Gospel; and besides this, adds to the Text.

And touching Beza's Translation, (which our English especially follow) the same Molinæus * Charges him, that He actually changes the Text; giving likewise several Instances of his Corruptions. Castalio also, a learned Calvinist, (as Osiander says) and skilful in the Tongues, reprehends Beza in a Book wholly written against his Corruptions; and says further, † I will not Note all his Errors, for that would require too large a Volume.

In short, Bucer and the Osiandrians, rise up against Luther for false Translations; Luther against Munster; Beza against Castalio; and Castalio against Beza; Calvin against Servetus; Illyricus both against Calvin and Beza. Staphylus and Emserus noted in Luther's Dutch Translation of the New Testament only, about 1400. Heretical Corruptions. And thus far of the Confess'd Corruptions in Foreign Protestant Translations.

If you desire a Character of our English Protestant Versions, pray be pleased to take it from the Words of these following Protestants; some of the most Zealous and precise of whom, in a certain Treatise, Entitled, A Petition directed to his most Excellent Majesty King JAMES the First, Complains, That Our Translation of the Psalms, comprised in our Book of Common-Prayer, doth in Addition, Substraction, and Alteration, differ from the Truth of the Hebrew in at least 200. places. (If 200. Corruptions were found in the Psalms only, and that by Protestants themselves, How many, think you, might be found from the beginning of Genesis, to the end of the Apocalyps, if examin'd by an Impartial and strict Examination?) And this they made the Ground of their Scruple, to make use of the Common-Prayer; remaining doubtful, Whether a Man may with a safe Conscience subscribe thereto: Tea, they Writ and Publish'd a particular Treatise, Entitled, A Defence of the Ministers Reasons for refusal of Subscribing: The whole Argument and Scope whereof, is only concerning Mis-translating: Tea, the Reader may see, in the beginning of the said Book, the Title of every Chapter (Twenty Six in all) pointing to the Mis-translations there handled in particular.

Mr. Carlile avouches, That the English Translators have deprav'd the Sence, obscur'd the Truth, and deceiv'd the Ignorant: That in many places they detort the Scriptures from the right Sence, and that they shew themselves to love Darknes more than Light; Falshood more than Truth: Which Dr. Reynolds objecting against the Church of England, Mr. Whitaker had no better Answer, than to say, What Mr. Carlile, with some others, has Written against some places Translated in our Bibles, makes nothing to the purpose; I have not said otherwise, but that some things may be amended.

Hospi. in
Concord.
Discord. fol.
138.
In Respons. ad
Defens. &
Respons.
Castal.
In Test.
1556. in
Præfat. & in
Annot. in
Mat. 3. & 4.
Luc. 2. Ad. 8.
& 10. 1 Cor. 1.
* In sua Tran-
slat. Nov. Test.
Part. 12.
fol. 110.

* In Test.
Part. 10. 30.
4. 64. 65. 66.
74. 99. &
Part. 8. 13.
14. 21. 23.
† In Defens.
Translat. pag.
170.
See Lind.
Dub. Pag. 84.
85. 96. 98.

Pet. directed
to his Majesty
pag. 75. 76.

That Christi
descended in-
to Hell, pag.
116. 117. 118.
121. 144.
Whitaker's
Answer to Dr.
Reynolds, pag.
255.

The P R E F A C E.

See the A-
bridgment,
which the Mi-
nisters of Lin-
coln Diocels
deliver'd to
his Majesty,
pag. 11, 12, 13.
Burger Apol.
Self. 6. and in
Cover's Answ.
to Burger,
pag. 93.
See the Trip-
ple Cord, pag.
147.

See the Con-
ference before
the King's
Majesty, pag.
46, and 47.
Apolog. con-
cerning Christ
descent into
Hell at Ddd.
Confer. before
His Majesty,
pag. 46.

Whitak. Answ
to D. Reynolds
pag. 235.
Dr. Gregory
Martin writ
a whole Trea-
tise against
them.
Bishop Tunstall
discover'd in
Tindal's New
Testament
only, no less
than 2000
Corruptions.

The Ministers of Lincoln Diocels could not forbear, in their great Zeal, to signifie to the King, that the English Translation of the Bible, is a Translation, that takes away from the Text, that adds to the Text, and that (sometimes) to the changing or obscuring of the Meaning of the Holy Ghost; calling it yet further, A Translation which is Absurd and Senceless, perverting (in many places) the Meaning of the Holy Ghost.

For which Cause, Protestants of tender Consciences made great scruple of subscribing thereto: How shall I (says Mr. Burger) approve under my hand, a Translation which hath so many Omissions, many Additions, which sometimes obscures, sometimes perverts the Sence; being sometimes senceless, sometimes contrary?

This great Evil of corrupting the Scripture, being well consider'd by Mr. Broughton, one of the most Zealous sort of Protestants, obliged him to Write an Epistle to the Lords of the Council, desiring them with all speed to procure a New Translation: Because (says he) that which is now in England is full of Errors. And in his Advertisements of Corruptions, he tells the Bishops, That their publick Translation of Scriptures into English is such, as that it perverts the Text of the Old Testament in 848 places, and that it causes Millions of Millions to reject the New Testament, and to run to Eternal Flames. A most dreadful Saying, certainly, for all those who are forc'd to receive such a Translation for their Only Rule of Faith.

King James the First, thought the Geneva Translation to be the worst of all; and further affirm'd, That in the Marginal Notes annex'd to the Geneva Translation, some are very Partial, Untrue, Seditious, &c. Agreeable to this are also these words of Mr. Parkes to Dr. Willet. — As for the Geneva Bibles, 'tis to be wish'd, that either they were Purg'd from those manifold Errors, which are both in the Text, and in the Margent, or else utterly prohibited.

Now, these our Protestant English Translations being thus confessedly Corrupt, Absurd, Senceless, Contrary, and perverting the meaning of the Holy Ghost; Had not King James the First just cause to affirm, That he could never yet see a Bible well Translated into English? And whether such falsely Translated Bibles ought to be imposed upon the Ignorant People, and by them receiv'd for the Very Word of God, and for their Only Rule of Faith, I refer to the Judgment of the World; and do freely assert with Dr. Whitaker, a Learned Protestant, That Translations are so far forth Only the Word of God, as they faithfully express the Meaning of the Authentical Text.

The English Protestant Translations having been thus Exclaim'd against, and Cry'd down not only by Catholicks, but even by the most Learned Protestants, as you have seen; It pleas'd his Majesty, King James the First, to Command a Review and Reformation of those Translations which had pass'd for God's Word in King Edward the Sixth, and Queen Elizabeth's days: Which Work was undertaken by the Prelatick Clergy, not so much (tis to be fear'd) for the Zeal of Truth, as appears by their having Corrected so very few places, as out of a design of Correcting some such faults as favour'd the more Puritanical part of Protestants (Presbyterians,) against the Usurped Authority, pretended Episcopacy, Ceremonies, and Traditions of the Prelatick Party. For Example, The word (Congregation) in their first Bibles, was the usual and only English word they made use of for the Greek and Latin word ἐκκλησία Ecclesia, because then the Name of Church was most Odious to them; Yea, they could not endure to hear any mention of a Church, because of the CATHOLICK CHURCH, which they had forsaken, and which withstood and condemn'd them. But now, being grown up to something (as themselves fancy) like a Church, they resolve in good earnest, to take upon them the Face, Figure, and Grandure of a Church; and to Censure, and Excommunicate, yea, and Persecute their Dissenting Brethren; rejecting therefore that
bumble

The P R E F A C E.

humble Appellation, which their Primitive Ancestors were content with, [viz. Congregation,] they assume the Title of Church, [the Church of England,] to Countenance which, they bring the Word [Church] again into their Translations, and Banish that their once Darling Congregation.

They have also, instead of Ordinances, Institutions, &c. been pleased in some places to Translate Traditions; thereby to vindicate several Ceremonies of Theirs against their Puritannical Brethren.

*The word [Image] being so shameful a Corruption, they were pleas'd likewise to Correct, and instead thereof to Translate Idol, according to the True Greek and Latin; Yet it appears that this was not amended out of any good Design, or love to Truth; but either merely out of Shame, or however to have it said that they had done something. Seeing they have not Corrected it in all places, especially in the Old-Testament, Exod. 20. where they yet read Image, [Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image,] The Word in Hebrew being *Pesel*, the very same that *Sculptile* is in Latin, and signifies in English a Graven or Carved Thing; and in the Greek *tu Eidolon*, [an Idol]: So that, by this False and Wicked Practice, they endeavour to discredit the Catholick Religion; and (contrary to their own Consciences, and Corrections in the New-Testament) endeavour to make the People believe, that Image and Idol are the same, and equally forbidden by Scripture, and GOD's Commandments; and consequently, that Popery is Idolatry, for admitting the due use of Images.*

They have also Corrected that most Absurd and Shameful Corruption [Grave,] and, as they ought to do, have instead of it Translated [Hell]; so that now they read, Thou wilt not leave my Soul in Hell; whereas Beza has it, Thou wilt not leave my Carcass in the Grave. Yet we see, that this is not out of any sincere Intention, or respect to Truth neither, because they have but Corrected it in some few places, not in all, (as you will see hereafter;) which they would not do, especially in Genesis, lest they should thereby be forc'd to admit of Limbus Patrum, where Jacob's Soul was to descend, when he said, I will go down to my Son into Hell, Mourning, &c. And to balance the Advantage they think they may have given Catholicks where they have Corrected it, they have (against Purgatory and Limbus Patrum) in another place most grossly Corrupted the Text: For whereas the words of our Saviour are, Quickned in Spirit (or Soul,) In the which Spirit coming, he Preached to them also that were in Prison; they translate, Quickned by the Spirit, by which also he went and Preached unto the Spirits in Prison. This was so notorious a Corruption, that Dr. Montague, afterwards Bishop of Chichester and Norwich, reprehended for it Sir Henry Savil, to whose Care the translating of St. Peter's Epistle was committed: But Sir Henry Savill told him plainly, That Dr. Abbot Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, and Dr. Smith Bishop of Gloucester, Corrupted and Altered the Translation of this place, which himself had sincerely performed. — Note here by the by, That if Dr. Abbot's Conscience could so lightly suffer him to Corrupt the Scripture, His [or his Servant Mason's] Forging the Lambeth-Records, could not possibly cause the least Scruple, especially being a thing so highly for their Interest and Honour.

These are the chiefest Faults they have Corrected in this their New Translation; and with what sinister Designs they have amended them, appears visible enough; to wit, Either to keep their Authority and gain Credit for their New-thought-on Episcopal and Priestly Character and Ceremonies against Puritans or Presbyterians; or else, for very shame, urg'd thereto by the Exclamations of Catholicks; daily Inveighing against such intolerable Falsifications. But because they resolv'd not to Correct either All, or the Tenth part of the Corruptions of the former Translation; therefore, fearing their Over-seen Falsifications would be observ'd, both by Puritans and Catholicks, In their Epistle Dedicatory to the

1 Peter 3. ver.
18, 19.

The P R E F A C E.

King, they desire His Majesty's Protection, for that On the one side, we shall be Traduc'd (say they) by Popish Persons at Home or Abroad, who therefore will Malign us, because we are poor Instruments to make GOD's Holy Truth to be yet more known unto the People, whom they desire still to keep in Ignorance and Darkness: On the other side, we shall be malign'd by self-conceited Brethren, who run their own ways, &c.

We see how they endeavour here to perswade the King and the World, That Catholicks are desirous to conceal the Light of the Gospel: Whereas, on the contrary, nothing is more obvious, than the daily and Indefatigable Endeavours of Catholick Missioners and Priests, not only in Preaching and Explaining GOD's Holy Word in Europe; but also in forsaking their own Countries and Conveniences, and Travelling with great Difficulties and Dangers by Sea and Land, into Asia, Africa, America, and the Antipodes, with no other Design than to publish the Doctrine of Christ, and to discover and manifest the Light of the Gospel to Infidels, who are in Darkness and Ignorance. Nor do any but Catholicks stick to the Old Letter and Sense of Scripture, without Altering the Text, or rejecting any part thereof, or devising New Interpretations; which certainly cannot demonstrate a desire in them to keep People in Ignorance and Darkness. Indeed, as for their Self-conceited Presbyterian and Phanatick Brethren, who run their own Ways in Translating and Interpreting Scripture, we do not excuse them, but only say, That we see no reason why Prelaticks should reprehend them for a Fault, whereof themselves are no less Guilty. Do not themselves of the Church of England run their own Ways also, (as well as those other Sectaries) in Translating the Bible? Do they stick to either the Greek, Latin, or Hebrew Text? Do they not leap from one Language and Copy to another? Accept and Reject what they please? Do they not fancy a Sense of their Own, every whit as contrary to that of the Catholick and Ancient Church, as that of their Self-conceited Brethren the Presbyterians, and others is Acknowledg'd to be? And yet they are neither more Learned nor more Skilful in the Tongues, nor more Godly than those they so much Contemn and Blame.

All Hereticks that have ever wag'd War against God's Holy Church, what-ever particular Weapons they have had, have generally made use of these Two, viz. Misrepresenting and Ridiculing the Doctrine of God's Church: And, Corrupting and Misinterpreting His Sacred Word, the Holy Scripture. We find not any since Simon Magus's Days, that have ever been more dexterous and skilful in handling these direful Arms, than the Hereticks of our Times.

In the first place, They are so great Masters and Doctors in Misrepresenting, Mocking, and Deriding Religion, that they seem even to have solely Devoted themselves to no other Profession or Place, but Cathedra Irreforum, the School or Chair of the Scorners, as David terms their Seat: Which the Holy Apostle St. Peter foresaw, when he foretold, that There should come in the latter Days, Illusores, SCOFFERS, walking after their own Lusts. To whom did this Prophecie ever better agree, than to the Hereticks of our Days, who deride the Sacred Scriptures? The Author of the Book of Ecclesiastes, (says one of them) had neither Boots nor Spurs, but rid on a long Stick, in Begging Shoes: Who Scoff at the Book of Judeth: Compare the Macchabees to Robin-hood, and Bevis of Southampton: Call Baruch, a peevish Ape of Jeremy: Count the Epistle to the Hebrews as Stubble: And deride St. James's, as an Epistle made of Straw: Contemn Three of the Four Gospels. What Ridiculing is this of the Word of God? Nor were the first Pretended Reformers only guilty of this, but the same Vein has still continu'd in the Writings, Preachings, and Teachings of their Successors; a great part of which, are nothing but a meer Mockery, Ridiculing, and Misrepresenting of the Doctrine of Christ, as is too notorious

The P R E F A C E.

and visible in the many scurrilous and scornful Writings and Sermons, lately publish'd by several Men of no small Figure in our English Protestant Church. By which Scoffing Stratagem, when they cannot LAUGH the Vulgar into a Contempt and Abhorrence of Christian Religion, They fly to their other Weapon, to wit, Imposing upon the Peoples weak Understanding, by a Corrupt, Imperfect, and False Translated Bible.

Dr. St. Dr. T.
Dr. S. Dr. T.
Mr. W. &c.

Tertullian complain'd thus of the Hereticks of his Time, *Ista Hæresis non recipit quædam Scripturas, &c.* These Hereticks admit not some Books of Scriptures; and those which they do admit, by adding to, and taking from, they pervert to serve their purpose: And if they receive some Books, yet they receive them not entirely; or if they receive them entirely, after some sort, nevertheless they spoyl them by devising divers Interpretations. In this Case, What will you do, that think your selves skilful in Scriptures, when that which you defend, the Adversary denys; and that which you deny, he defends? *Et tu quidem nihil perdes nisi vocem de Contentione, nihil consequeris nisi bilem de Blasphematione:* And you indeed shall lose nothing but words in this Contention; nor shall you gain any thing but Anger from his Blasphemy. *How fitly may these words be apply'd to the pretended Reformers of our days, who, when told of their Abusing, Corrupting, and Mis-interpreting the Holy Scriptures, are so far from acknowledging their Faults, that on the contrary they blush not to defend them.* When Mr. Martin, in his Discovery, told them of their Falsifications in the Bible, did they thank him for letting them see their Mistakes, (as indeed Men, endu'd with the Spirit of Sincerity and Honesty, would have done?) No, they were so far from that, that Fulk, as much as in him lies, endeavours very obstinately to defend them: And Whittaker affirms, That their Translations are well done, (*Why then were they afterwards Corrected?*) and that all the faults Mr. Martin finds in them, are but Trifles; demanding, what there is in their Bibles that can be found fault with, as not Translated well and truly? Such a Pertinacious, Obstinate, and Contentious Spirit, are Hereticks possess'd with, which indeed is the very thing that renders them Hereticks; for with such I do not rank those in the List, who, tho' they have even with their first Milk (as I may say) imbib'd their Errors, and have been Educated from their Child-hood in Erroneous Opinions, yet do neither pertinaciously adhere to the same, nor obstinately resist the Truth, when propos'd to them; but, on the contrary, are willing to Imbrace it.

Whit. p. 74.

How many Innocent, and well-meaning People, are there in England, who have scarce in all their Life-time, ever heard any mention of a Catholick, or Catholick Religion, unless under these Monstrous and frightful Terms of Idolatry, Superstition, Antichristianism, &c? How many have ever heard a better Character of Catholicks, than Bloody-minded People, Thirsters after Blood, Worshippers of Wooden Gods, Prayers to Stocks and Stones, Idolaters, Anti-christs, The Beast in the Revelations, and what not that may render them more Odious than Hell, and more Frightful than the Devil himself, and that from the Mouths and Pens of their Teachers, and Ministerial Guides? Is it then to be wonder'd at, that these so grossly-deceiv'd people, should entertain a strange prejudice against Religion, and a Detestation of Catholicks?

Whereas, if these Blind-folded people were once undeceiv'd, and brought to understand, that all these Monstrous Scandals are falsely charg'd upon Catholicks; That Catholick Doctrine is so far from Idolatry, that it Teaches the quite contrary, viz. That whosoever gives God's Honour to Stocks and Stones, (as Protestants phrase it,) to Images, to Saints, to Angels, or to any Creature; yea, to anything but to God himself, is an Idolater, and will be Damn'd for the same; That Catholicks are so far from thirsting after the Blood of others, that, on the contrary, their Doctrine teaches them, not only to love God above all, and their

The P R E F A C E.

Neighbour as themselves, but even to love their Enemies. In short, So far different is the Roman Catholick Religion from what it is by Protestants Represented, that, on the contrary, Faith, Hope, and Charity, are the Three Divine Virtues it Teaches us: Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance, are the Four Moral Virtues it exhorts us to: Which Christian Vertues, when it happens that they are, through Human Frailty, and the Temptations of our Three Enemies, the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, either Wounded or Lost; Then are we taught to apply our selves to such Divine Remedies, as our Blessed Saviour Christ has left us in his Church, viz. His Holy Sacraments, by which our Spiritual Infirmities are Cur'd and Repair'd. By the Sacrament of Baptism, We are Taught, That Original Sin is forgiven, and that the Party Baptiz'd is Regenerated, and Born a New unto the Mystical Body of Christ, of which by Baptism he is made a lively Member: So likewise by the Sacrament of Penance all our Actual Sins are forgiven; the same Holy Spirit of God working in this to the forgiveness of Actual Sin, that wrought before in the Sacrament of Baptism to the forgiveness of Original Sin. We are Taught likewise, That by partaking of Christ's very Body, and his very Blood, in the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, We by a perfect Union dwell in Him, and He in Us; and that as Himself rose again for our Justification, so we, at the Day of Judgment, shall in him receive a Glorious Resurrection, and Reign with Him for all Eternity, as Glorious Members of the same Body, whereof Himself is the Head. It further Teaches us, That none but a Priest, truly Consecrated by the Holy Sacrament of Order, can Consecrate and Administer the Holy Sacraments. ——— This is our Religion, This is the Center it tends too, and the sole End it aims at; which point, we are further taught, can never be gain'd but by a True Faith, a Firm Hope, and a Perfect Charity.

To Conclude, If (I say) thousands of well-meaning Protestants understood this, as also that Protestantism it self is nothing else but a meer Imposture begun in England, maintain'd and upheld by the Wicked Policy of Self-Interested Statesmen; and still continu'd by Misrepresenting & Ridiculing the Catholick Religion, by Misinterpreting the holy Scriptures; yea, by Falsifying, Abusing, and (as will appear in this following Treatise) by most Abominably Corrupting the Sacred Word of God: How far would it be from them Obstinate and Pertinaciously to adhere to the False and Erroneous Principles, in which they have hitherto been Educated? How willingly would they submit their Understandings to the Obedience of Faith? How earnestly would they Embrace that Rule of Faith, which our Blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, left us for our Guide to Salvation? With what diligence would they bend all their Studies, to learn the most wholesome and saving Doctrine of God's Holy Church? In fine, If once Enlightned with a True Faith, and Encourag'd with a Firm Hope, What Zealous Endeavours would they not use to acquire such Virtues, and Christian Perfections, as might Enflame them with a Perfect Charity, which is the very Ultimate and highest Step to Eternal Felicity? To which God of his Infinite Goodness, and tender Mercy, through the Merits and Bitter Death and Passion of our Dear Saviour, Jesus Christ, bring us All. Amen.

THE
TRUTH
OF
Protestant Translations
OF THE
BIBLE,
EXAMINED.



OUR Pretended Reformers, having Squar'd and Modell'd to themselves a FAITH, contrary to the certain and direct RULE of APOSTOLICAL TRADITION, deliver'd in God's Holy Church, were forc'd to have Recourse to the Scripture, as their ONLY RULE OF FAITH; according to which, the *Church of England* has, in the *Sixth* of her 39 Articles, declar'd, *That the Scripture comprehended in the Canonical Books (i. e. so many of them as She thinks fit to call so) of the Old and New Testament, is the Rule of Faith so far, that whatsoever is not Read therein, or cannot be prov'd thereby, is not to be accepted as any Point of Faith, or needful to be follow'd.* But finding themselves still at a loss, their New Doctrins being so far from being contain'd in the Holy Scripture, that they were directly opposite to it; they were fain to seek out to themselves many other Inventions; amongst which, none was more generally Practis'd, than the *Corrupting* of the Holy Scripture by *False* and *Partial* Translations; by which they Endeavour'd, Right or Wrong, to make those Sacred *Volumes* speak in Favour of their *New-Invented* Faith and Doctrine.

173. *Supr.*Tom. 5. *Wit-*
umb. fol. 2. o.
in Ep. ad
Galat. cap. 1.De Capit. Ba-
bul. cap. de
Extrem-unct.
Tom. 2. *Wit-*
te mb.See the f. cond
D. ferce of
the Exposition
of the Doct.
of the Church
of Engl. &c.Cens. 1. l. 2.
c. 10. col. 580.Calvin in
Gal. t. c. 2.
v. 14 p. 511.Lavater.
in Histor.
Sacrament.
pag. 18.

The Corruptions of this Nature, in the first *English* Protestant Translations, were so many, and so Notorious, that Dr. *Gregory Martin* composed a whole Book of them, in which he discovers the Fraudulent Shifts the Translators were fain to make use of, in defence of them. Sometimes they recurr'd to the *Hebrew* Text; and when That spoke against their New Doctrine, then to the *Greek*; when That favour'd them not, to some Copy acknowledg'd by themselves to be corrupted, and of no Credit: And when no Copy at all could be found out to cloak their Corruptions, then must the Book or Chapter of Scripture contradicting them, be declar'd *Apocryphal*: And when that cannot be made probable, they fall down-right upon the *Prophets* and *Apostles* that Writ them, saying, *That they might, and did ERR, even after the Coming of the Holy Ghost.* Thus *Luther*, accus'd by *Zuinglius* for Corrupting the Word of God, had no way left to defend his Impiety, but by Impudently preferring himself, and his own Spirit, before that of those who Writ the Holy Scriptures, saying, *Be it that the Church, Augustine, and other Doctors, also Peter and Paul, yea, an Angel from Heaven, Teach otherwise, yet is my Doctrine such as sets forth God's Glory, &c.* Peter, the Chief of the Apostles, liv'd and taught (extra verbum Dei,) besides the Word of God.

And against St. *James's* mentioning the Sacrament of *Extream Unction*: But tho' (says he) *this were the Epistle of James, I would Answer, That it is not lawful for an Apostle, by his Authority, to Institute a Sacrament; this appertains to Christ alone.* As tho' that Blessed Apostle would publish a Sacrament without Warrant from Christ! Our Church of *England* Divines having unadvisedly put St. *James's* Epistle into the Canon, are forc'd, instead of such an Answer, to say, *That the Sacrament of Extream Unction was yet [viz. In the days of Gregory the Great,] Unborn.* As tho' the Apostle St. *James* had spoken he knew not what, when he Advis'd, That the Sick should be by the Priests of the Church, *Anointed with Oyl in the Name of our Lord.*

Nor was this *Luther's* shift alone; for all Protestants follow their first pretended Reformer in this Point, being necessitated so to do for the Maintenance of their Reformati- ons, and Translations, so directly opposite to the known Letter of the Scripture.

The *Magdeburgians* follow *Luther*, in accusing the Apostles of Error, particularly St. *Paul*, by the perswasion of *James*.

Brentius also (whom *Jewel* terms a Grave and Learned Father,) affirms, *That St. Peter, the Chief of the Apostles, and also Barnabas, after the Holy Ghost receiv'd, together with the Church of Jerusalem, Err'd.*

John Calvin affirms, *That Peter added to the Schism of the Church, to the endangering of Christian Liberty, and the overthrow of the Grace of Christ:* And in pag. 150. he reprehends *Peter* and *Barnabas*, and others.

Zanchius mentions some Calvinists in his Epist. ad Misc. who said, *If Paul should come to Geneva, and Preach the same hour with Calvin, they would leave Paul, and hear Calvin.*

And *Lavaterus* affirms, *That some of Luther's Followers, not the meanest among their Doctors, said, They had rather doubt of St. Paul's Doctrine, than the Doctrine of Luther, or of the Confession of Auslurge.*

This desperate Shift being so necessary, for warranting their Corruptions of Scripture, and maintaining the *Falibility* of the Church in succeeding Ages, (for the same reasons which conclude it *Infalible* in the Apostles time, are applicab. to ours, and to every former Century; otherwise it mst be said, that God's Providence and Promises were limited to few years, and Himself so Partial, but he regards not the Necessities of his Church, nor the Salvation of any person that liv'd after the time of his Disciples;) the Church of *England* could

could not reject it without contradicting their Brethren abroad, and their own Principles at home. Therefore Mr. Jewel, in his Defence of the Apology for the Church of England, affirms, That St. Mark mistook *Abiathar* for *Abimelech*; and St. Matthew, *Hieremias* for *Zacharias*. And Mr. Fulk against the *Rhemish Testament*, in *Galat. 2. fol. 322.* charges *Peter* with Error of Ignorance against the Gospel.

pag. 361.

Dr. Goad, in his four Disputations with F. Campion, affirms, *That St. Peter err'd in Faith, and that, after the sending down of the Holy Ghost upon them.* And Whitaker says, 'Tis evident, that even after Christs Ascention, and the Holy Ghosts descending upon the Apostles, the whole Church, not only the common sort of Christians, but also even the Apostles themselves, Erred in the Vocation of the Gentiles, &c. Tea, Peter also Err'd. He furthermore Err'd in Manners, &c. And these were great Errors; and yet we see these to have been in the Apostles, even after the Holy Ghost descended upon them.

The Second days Conference.
V Whitaker de Ecclesi. contr. Beliar. Contravers. 2. q. 4. p. 223.

Thus these *Fallible* Reformers, who, to Countenance their Corruptions of Scripture, Grace their own Errors, and Authorize their Churches *Fallibility*, would make the Apostles themselves *Fallible*; but indeed, they need not to have gone this bold way to work, for we are satisfied, and can very easily believe their Church to be *Fallible*, their Doctrines *Erroneous*, and themselves *Corrupters* of the Scriptures, without being forc'd to hold, that the Apostles Err'd.

Protestants to Authorize their own Errors and Fallibility, would make the Apostles themselves Erroneous and Fallible.

And truly, if (as they say) the Apostles were not only *Fallible*, but taught Errors in *Manners*, and *Matters of Faith*, after the Holy Ghost's descending upon them, their Writings can be no *Infallible Rule*, (or, as themselves Term it, *Perfect Rule of Faith*;) to direct Men to Salvation: Which Conclusion is so immediately and clearly deduc'd from this *Protestant Doctrine*, that the Supposal and Premises once granted, there can be no certainty in the *SCRIPTURE* it self. And indeed, this (we see) all the pretended Reformers aim'd at, tho' they durst not say so much, and we shall in this little Tract make it most evidently appear from their intolerable abusing it, how little esteem and slight regard they have for the *Sacred Scripture*; tho' they make their ignorant Flocks believe, that, as they have Translated it, and deliver'd it to them, it is the *Pure and Infallible Word of God*.

Before I come to particular Examples of their Falsifications and Corruptions, let me Advertise my Reader, That my Intention is to make use only of such *English* Translations, as are common, and well known in *England* even to this day, as being yet in many Mens hands; to wit, Those Bibles Printed in the Years 1562, 1577, and 1579, in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeths* Reign; which I will confront with their last Translation made in *King James* the first Reign, from the Impression Printed at *London* in the Year 1683.

In all which said Bibles, I shall take notice sometimes of one Translation, sometimes of another, as every ones Falshood shall give occasion: Neither is it a good Defence for the Falshood of one, that it is truly Translated in another, the Reader being deceiv'd by any one, because commonly he reads but one; yea, one of them is a *Condemnation* of the other. And where the *English* Corruptions, here noted, are not to be found in one of the first three Bibles, let the Reader look in another of them; for if he find not the Falsification in *All*, he will certainly find it in *Two*, or at least *One* of them: And in this Case, I advertise the Reader to be very circumspect, that he think not, by and by these are falsly Charged, because there may be found perhaps some later Edition, wherein the same Error we Noted, may be Corrected; For 'tis their common and known Fashion, not only in their Translations of the Bible, but in their other Books and Writings, to

Bib. 1562; 77. or 79.

alter and change, add and put out, in their later Editions, according as either themselves are ashamed of the former, or their Scholars that Print them again, Dissent or Dis-agree from their Masters.

* See the Preface of the Rhemes New Testament.

Note also, That tho' I do not so much charge them with falsifying the *Vulgar Latin Bible*, which has always been of so great Authority in the Church of God, and with all the * Antient Fathers, as I do the *Greek*, which they pretend to Translate: I cannot however but observe, That as *Luther* wilfully forsook the Latin Text in favour of his Heresies and Erroneous Doctrines; so the rest follow his Example even to this day for no other cause in the World, but that it makes against their Errors.

1 Cor. 9. v. 5.
Mulierem
Sororem.
2 Pet. 1. ver.
10. Ut per
bona opera
certam vestram
vocationem
& Electionem
faciat.

For Testimony of which, what greater Argument can there be than this, That *Luther*, who before had always Read with the Catholick Church, and with all Antiquity, these words of St. Paul, *Have not we Power to lead about a Woman, a Sister, as also the rest of the Apostles?* And in St. Peter these words, *Labour that by Good Works, you may make sure your Vocation and Election:* Suddenly after he had, contrary to his Profession, taken a *Wife*, (as he call'd her) and Preach'd, that all other Votaries might do the same: That *Faith alone Justify'd*, and that *Good Works were not necessary to Salvation:* Immediately (I say) after he fell into these Heresies, he began to Read and Translate the former Texts of Scripture accordingly, in this manner, — *Have not we Power to lead about a Sister, a Wife, as the rest of the Apostles?* And, *Labour that you may make sure your Vocation and Election;* leaving out the other words [*By Good Works.*] And so do both the *Calvinists* abroad, and our *English* Protestants at home, Read and Translate even to this day, because they hold the self-same Errors.

I would gladly know of our *English* Protestant Translators, Whether they Reject the *Vulgar Latin* Text, (so generally lik'd and approv'd by all the Primitive Fathers) purely out of design to furnish us with a more sincere and simple Version into *English* from the *Greek*, than they thought they could do from the *Vulgar Latin*? If so, Why do they not stick close to the *Greek Copy*, which they pretend to Translate, but (besides their Corrupting of it) fly from it, and have recourse again to the *Vulgar Latin*, when ever it may seem to make more for their purpose: Whence may be easily gather'd, that their pretending to Translate the *Greek Copy* was not of any good and candid Design, but rather, because they knew it was not so easie a matter for the Ignorant to discover their false Dealings from it as from the *Latin*; and also, because they might have the fairer pretence for their turning and winding too and fro from the *Greek* to the *Latin*, and then again to the *Greek*, according as they should judge most advantageous to them. It was also no little part of their Design, *To lessen the Credit and Authority of the Vulgar Latin Translation*, which had so long, and with so general a consent been receiv'd and approv'd in the Church of God, and Authoriz'd by the General Council of *Trent*, for the only best, and most Authentick Text.

Because therefore I find they will scarce be able to justify their rejecting the *Latin* Translation, unless they had dealt more sincerely with the *Greek*, I have, in this following Work, set down the *Latin* Text, (as well as the *Greek* word whereon their Corruption depends;) yet, where they truly keep to the *Greek* and *Hebrew*, which they profess to follow, and which they will have to be the most Authentick Text, I do not charge them with Heretical Corruptions.

The Left-hand Page I have divided into four Columns, (besides the Margent, in which I have noted the *Book*, *Chapter*, and *Verse*.) In the First I have set down the Text of Scripture from the *Vulgar Latin* Edition, putting the Word that their *English* Bibles have Corrupted in a different Character; to which I have also added the *Greek* and

and *Hebrew* words, so often as they are, or may be necessary for the better understanding of the word on which the *Stress* lies in the Corrupt Translation.

In the Second Column I have given you the true *English* Text from the *Roman Catholic* Translation, made by the Divines of *Rhemes* and *Doway*; which is done so faithfully and candidly from the Authentick *Vulgar Latin* Copy, that the most Carping and Critical Adversary in the World cannot accuse it of Partiality or Design, contrary to the very true Meaning and Interpretation thereof. As for the *English* of the said *Rhemish* Translation, which is Old, and therefore must needs differ much from the more refin'd *English* spoken at this day, the Reader ought to consider, not only the place where 'twas Writ, but also the time since which the Translation was made, and then he will find the less fault with it. For my part, because I have referr'd my Reader to the said Translation made at *Rhemes*, I have not alter'd one syllable of the *English*, though indeed I might in some places have made the word more agreeable to the Language of our Times.

In the Third Column you have the Corruption, and False Translation, from those Bibles that were set forth in *English* at the beginning of that most miserable Revolt and Apostacy from the *Catholic Church*, viz. from that Bible which was Translated in King *Edward* the Sixth's Time, and Reprinted in the Year 1562, and from the two next Impressions, made *Anno* 1577, and 1579. All which were Authoriz'd in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, when the Church of *England* began to get Footing, and to Exercise Dominion over her Fellow-Sectaries, as well as to Tyrannize over *Catholics*: whence it cannot be deny'd, but those Bibles were wholly agreeable to the Principles and Doctrine of the said Church of *England* in those days, however they pretend at this day to Correct or Alter them.

In the Fourth Column, you find one of the last Impressions of their *Protestant Bible*, viz. That Printed at *London* by the Assigns of *John Bill* Deceased, and by *Henry Hills* and *Thomas Newcomb*, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, *Anno Dom.* 1683. ----- In which Bible, where-ever I find them to have Corrected and Amended the place Corrupted in their former Translations, I have put down the word [*Corrected*;] but where the Falsification is not yet Rectified, I have set down likewise the Corruption: And that indeed is in most places, yea, and in some two or three places, they have made it rather worse than better: And this indeed gives me great reason to suspect, that in those few places, where the Errors of the former *False Translations* have been Corrected in the latter, it has not always been the Effect of Plain-dealing and Sincerity; for if such Candid Intention of amending former Faults had every-where prevail'd with them, they would not in any place have made it worse, but would also have Corrected all the rest, as well as one or two, that are not now so much to their purpose, as they were at their first Rising.

In the Right-hand Page of this Treatise, I have set down the Motives and Inducements, that (as we may reasonably presume) prompted them to Corrupt and Falsify the Sacred Text, with some short Arguments here and there against their Unwarrantable Proceedings.

All which I have contriv'd in as short and compendious a Method as I possibly could, knowing that there are many, who are either not able, or at least not willing to go to the Price of a great Volume. And because my desire is to be Beneficial to *All*, I have accommodated it not only to the *Purse* of the *Poorest*, but also (as near as possible) to the *Capacity* of the most *Ignorant*; For which Reasons also, I have pass'd by a great many Learned Arguments brought by my Author, from the *Significations*, *Etymologies*, *Deri-*

Dr. Martin.

uations, Uses, &c. of the Greek and Hebrew words, as also from the comparing of places Corrupted, with other places rightly Translated from the *same Word*, in the *same Translation*; with several other things, whereby he largely Confutes their insincere and dis-ingenuous Proceedings: These, I say, I have omitted, not only for *brevity sake*, but also as things that could not be of any *great benefit* to the Simple and Unlearned Reader.

As for others *more Learned*, I will refer them to the Work it self, that I have made use of through this whole Treatise, viz. To that most *Elaborate* and *Learned Work* of Mr. Gregory Martin, Entitled, *A Discovery of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures*, &c. Printed at Rhemes, Anno 1582. which is not hard to be found.

Have we not great Cause to Believe, that our Protestant Divines do obstinately teach contrary to their own Consciences? For, (besides their having been reprov'd, without amendment, for their Impious handling the Holy Scripture,) if their Learning be so *Profound* and *Bottomless*, as themselves proudly boast in all their Works, we cannot but conclude, that they must needs both *See* their *Errors*, and *know* the *Truth*. And therefore, tho' we cannot always cry out of them, and their Followers, [*The Blind lead the Blind*,] yet, which is Alas! a thousand times more miserable, we may justly Exclaim, [*Those who SEE, lead the Blind*, till with themselves they fall into the Ditch!]

As nothing has ever been worse resented by such as forsake God's Holy Church, than to hear themselves branded with the general Title of *Hereticks*; so nothing has been ever more common among *Catholicks*, than justly to Stigmatize such with the same Infamous Character. I am not Ignorant, how ill the *Protestants* of our days resent this *Term*, and therefore do avoid, as much as the Nature of this Work will permit, the giving them the least disgust by this horrid Appellation: Nevertheless I must needs give them to understand, that the Nature of the Holy Scripture is such, that whosoever do voluntarily Corrupt and Pervert it, to Maintain their own Erroneous Doctrines, cannot lightly be Character'd by a less Infamous Title, than that of *HERETICKS*; and their false Versions, by the Title of *HERETICAL TRANSLATIONS*, under which Denomination I have plac'd these following Corruptions.

Notwithstanding, I would have the *Protestant Reader* to take Notice, that I neither *Name* nor *Judge* all to be *Hereticks* (as is hinted in my *Preface*,) who hold Errors contradictory to God's Church, but such as pertinaciously persist in their Errors.

So proper and Essential is *Pertinacy* to the Nature of *Heresie*, that if a Man should hold or Believe never so many false Opinions against the Truth of *Christian Faith*, but yet not with *Obstinacy* and *Pertinacy*, he should ERR, but not be an *Heretick*. Saint *Augustin* asserting, *That if any do defend their Opinions, tho' False and Perverse, with no Obstinate Animosity, but rather with all Solitude do seek the Truth, and are ready to be Corrected when they find the same, These Men are not to be accounted for Hereticks, because they have not any Election of their own that contradicts the Doctrine of the Church.* And in another place, against the *Donatists*: *Let us* (says he) *suppose some Man to hold that of Christ at this Day, which the Heretick Photinus did, to wit, That Christ was only Man, and not God, and that he should think this to be the Catholick Faith; I will not say that he is an Heretick, unless when the Doctrine of the Church is made manifest unto him, he will rather chuse to hold that which he held before, than yield thereunto.*

I say, *Those*, says he, *who in the Church of CHRIST, hold Infectious and Perverse Doctrine, if when they are Corrected for it, they resist Stubbornly, and will not amend their pestilent and deadly Persuasive, but persist to defend the same, THESE MEN ARE*

MADE

S. Aug. Ep.
162.

Lib. 4. contr.
Donat. c. 6.

De Civit Dei
lib. 18. c. 51.

MADE HERETICKS: By all which places of *St. Augustin*, we see, that *ERROR* without *PERTINACT*, and *Obstinacy* against *GOD's Church* is no *Heresie*: It would be well therefore, if *Protestants*, in reading *Catholick Books*, would endeavour rather to inform themselves of the *TRUTH* of *Catholick Doctrine*, and humbly embrace the same, than to suffer that *Prejudice against Religion*, in which they have unhappily been Educated, so strongly to *Byass* them, as to turn them from *Men barely Educated in Error*, to *Obstinate Hereticks*; such as the more harden their own Hearts, by how much the more clearly the *Doctrine of GOD's Holy Church* is demonstrated to them. When the *True Faith* is once made known to Men, *Ignorance* can no longer secure them from that *Eternal Punishment* to which *Heresie* undoubtedly hurries them: *St. Paul*, in his Epistle to *Titus*, affirming, *That a Man that is an Heretick, after the first and second Admonition, is Subverted, and Sinneth, being condemn'd of his own Judgment.*

*Titus cap. 1.
ver. 10.*

What-ever may be said therefore, to excuse the *Ignorant*, and such as are not *Obstinate*, from that *Ignominious Character*; yet as for other, especially the *Leaders* of these misguided People, they will scarce be able to free themselves either from it, or escape the *Punishment* due to such, so long as they thus wilfully demonstrate their *Pertinacy*, not only in their *Obstinately* defending their *Erroneous Doctrines* in their *Disputes*, *Sermons*, and *Writings*; but even in *Corrupting* the Word of *GOD*, to force that *Sacred Book* to defend the same, and compel that *Divine Volume* to speak against such *Points of Catholick Doctrine* as themselves are pleas'd to deny.

In what can an *Heretical Intention* more evidently appear, than in *falsly Translating* and *Corrupting* the *Holy Bible*, against the *Catholick Church*, and such *Doctrines* as it has by an *uninterrupted Tradition*, brought down to us from the *Apostles*? As for *Example*:

Against the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar.

Against the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist.

Against Priests, and the Power of Priesthood.

Against the Authority of Bishops.

Against the Sacred Altar on which Christ's Body and Blood is Offer'd.

Against the Sacrament of Baptism.

Against the Sacrament of Penance, and Confession of Sins.

Against the Sacrament of Marriage.

Against Intercession of Saints.

Against Sacred Images.

Against Purgatory, Limbus Patrum, and Christ's Descent into Hell.

Against Justification, and the possibility of Keeping GOD's Commandments.

Against Meritorious Works, and the Reward due to the same.

Against Free-Will.

Against True Inherent Justice. and in defence of their own Doctrine, that Only Faith is sufficient to Salvation.

Against Apostolical Traditions.

Yea, against several other *Doctrines of GOD's Holy Church*, and in defence of divers strange *Opinions* of their own, which the *Reader* will find taken notice of in this *Treatise*: All which, when the *unprejudic'd*, and well-meaning *Protestant Reader* has consider'd, I am confident he will be struck with *Amazement*, and even terrify'd to look upon such *abominable Corruptions*!

Doubtless the generality of *Protestants* have hitherto been Ignorant (and more's the pity) of this ill-handling of the *Bible* by their Translators: Nor have, I am confident, their Ministerial Guides ever yet dealt so Ingenuously by them, as to tell them that *such* and *such* a Text of *Scripture* is translated *thus* and *thus*, contrary to the true *Greek*, *Hebrew*, or Ancient *Latin* Copies on Purpose, and to the only Intent, to make it speak against *such* and *such* points of *Catholick* Doctrine, and in favour of *this* or *that* New Opinion of their Own.

Does it appear to be done of *Negligence*, *Ignorance*, or *Mistake* (as perhaps they would be willing to have the *Reader* believe) or rather *Designedly* and *Wilfully*, when what they in some places translate Truly, in places of Controversie, between *Them* and *Us*, they grossly Falsify, in favour of their Errors?

Is it not a certain Argument of a wilful Corruption, where they deviate from that Text, and Ancient Reading, which has been us'd by all the Fathers; and instead thereof, to make the Exposition or Commentary of some One Doctor, the very Text of *Scripture* it self?

So also when in their Translations they fly from the *Hebrew* or *Greek* to the Vulgar *Latin*, where those Originals make against them, or not so much for their purpose, it is a manifest sign of wilful Partiality: And this they frequently do.

What is it else but wilful Partiality, when in Words of ambiguous and divers significations, they will have it signifie *here* or *there*, as pleases themselves? So that in this place it must signifie *thus*, in that place, not *thus*; As *Beza*, and one of their *English* Bibles (for Example) urge the *Greek* word [*ἡ γυναῖς*] to signifie *Wife*, and not to signifie *Wife*, both against the Virginity and Chastity of *Priests*.

What is it but a voluntary and designed contrivance, when in a case That makes for them, they strain the very Original signification of the Word; and in the contrary Case, neglect it altogether? Yet this they do.

That their Corruptions are voluntary and designedly done, is evident in such places where *Passives* are turn'd into *Actives*, and *Actives* into *Passives*; where *Participles* are made to disagree in Case from their *Substantives*; where *Solacisms* are imagin'd when the Construction is most agreeable; and *Errors* pretended to creep out of the *Margent* into the *Text*: But *Beza* made use of all these, and more such like Querks.

Another note of wilful Corruption is, when they do not translate alike such words as are of like *Form* and *Force*: Example, if *Ulcerosus* be read *Full of Sores*, why must not *Gratiosa* be translated *Full of Grace*?

When the words, *Images*, *Shrines*, *Procession*, *Devotions*, *Excommunications*, &c. are us'd in ill part, where they are not in the Original Text; and the words *Hymns*, *Grace*, *Mystery*, *Sacrament*, *Church*, *Altar*, *Priest*, *Catholick*, *Justification*, *Tradition*, &c. avoided and suppress'd, where they are in the Original, as if no such Words were in the Text: Is it not an apparent token of Design, and that it is done purposely to disgrace or suppress the said Things and Speeches?

Tho' *Beza* and *Whitaker* made it a *Good Rule* to translate according to the *Usual Signification*, and not the *Original Derivation* of Words; yet, contrary to this *Rule*, they translate *Idolum*, an *Image*; *Presbyter*, an *Elder*; *Diaconus*, a *Minister*; *Episcopus*, an *Overseer*, &c. Who sees not therefore but this is wilful Partiality?

If where the Apostle names a *Pagan Idolater*, and a *Christian Idolater*, by one and the same *Greek* Word, in one and the same Meaning; and they translate the *Pagan*, [*Idolater*;] and the *Christian*, [*Worshipper of Images*,] by two distinct Words, and in two divers Meanings, it must needs be wilfully done.

No less appears it to be designedly done, to translate one and the same *Greek* word [*μεταδοσις*] *Tradition*, whensoever it may be taken for *Evil Traditions*; and never so, when it is spoken of *Good and Apostolical Traditions*.

So likewise when they foist into their Translation the word *Tradition*, taken in ill part, where it is not in the *Greek*; and omit it where it is in the *Greek*, when taken in good Part; 'tis certainly a most wilful Corruption.

At their first Revolt, when none were noted for *Schismatics* and *Hereticks* but Themselves, they translated *Division* and *Seet*, instead of *Schism* and *Herefie*; and for *Heretick*, translated *An Author of Seets*: This cannot be excus'd of voluntary Corruption.

But why should I multiply Examples, when 'tis evident from their own Confessions and Acknowledgments? For instance, Concerning *μετανοια*, which the Vulgar *Latin* and *Erasmus* Translate, *Agere Pœnitentiam*, Do Penance: This Interpretation (says Beza) *I refuse for many Causes; but for this especially, That many Ignorant Persons have taken hereby an Occasion of the false Opinions of SATISFACTION, where-with the Church is troubled at this Day.*

Many other ways there are, to make most certain Proofs of their Wilfulness; as when the Translation is fram'd according to their *False and Heretical Commentary*; and when they will avouch their Translations out of Prophane Writers, as *Homer, Plutarch, Pliny, Tully, Virgil, and Terence*, and Reject the Ecclesiastical Use of Words in the Scriptures and Fathers; which is Beza's usual Custom, whom our *English Translators* follow. But to note all their Marks were too tedious a Work, neither is it in this Place necessary: These are sufficient to satisfy the Impartial Reader, that All those Corruptions and Falsifications were not committed either through Negligence, Ignorance, Over-sight, or Mistake, as perhaps they will be glad to pretend; but *Designedly, Wilfully*, and of a *Malicious Purpose and Intention*, to Disgrace, Dishonour, Condemn, and Suppress the *Churches Catholick and Apostolick Doctrines and Principles*; and to Favor, Defend, and Bolster-up their own New-devi'd *Errors, and Monstrous Opinions*. And Beza is not far from confessing thus much, when against *Castalio* he thus complains: *The Matter (says he) is now come to this Point, that the Translators of Scripture out of the Greek into Latin, or into any other Tongue, think that they may lawfully do any thing in Translating; whom if a Man reprehend, he shall be answer'd by and by, That they do the Office of a Translator, not that Translates Word for Word, but that expresses the Sense: So it comes to pass, that whilst every Man will rather freely follow his own Judgment, than be a Religious Interpreter of the Holy Ghost, he rather Perverts many things, than Translates them.* This is spoken well enough, if he had done accordingly. But doing the quite contrary, Is he not a Dissembling Hypocrite in so saying, and a Wilful Heretick in so doing?

Our Quarrel with *Protestant Translators* is not for trivial or slight Faults, or for such verbal Differences, or little Escapes as may happen through the scarce-unavoidable Mistakes of the Transcribers or Printers: No! we accuse them of *Wilfully Corrupting* and *Falsifying* the Sacred Text, against Points of *FAITH* and *MANNERS*.

We deny not but several immaterial Faults and Depravations may enter a Translation, nor do we pretend that the *Vulgata* it self was free from such, before the Correction of *Sixtus V.* and *Clement VIII.* which through the Mistakes of *Printers*, and, before *Printing*, of *Transcribers*, happen'd to several Copies: So that a great many verbal Differences, and lesser Faults were by Learned Men discover'd in different Copies: (Not that any material Corruption in points of *Faith* were found in all Copies; for such God

See a Book Entitled, Reason and Religion, cap. 8. where the Sixine and Clementine Bibles are more fully treated of.

Almighty's Providence, as *Protestants* themselves confess, would never suffer to enter): And indeed these lesser Depravations are not easily avoided, especially after several Transcriptions of Copies and Impressions from the Original, as we daily see in other Books.

To amend and rectifie such, The Church (as you may read in the Preface to the *Sixtine* Edition) has us'd the greatest Industry imaginable. Pope *Pius IV.* caus'd not only the Original Languages, but other Copies to be carefully examin'd: *Pius V.* Prosecuted that Laborious Work: And by *Sixtus V.* it was finish'd; who commanded it to be put to the Press, as appears by his *Bull*, which begins, *Eternus ille Cælestium, &c. Anno 1585.* Yet, notwithstanding the *Bull* prefixt before his *Bible* (then Printed) the same Pope *Sixtus* (as is seen in the Preface made *Anno 1592.*) after diligent Examination, found no few Faults slip't into his Impression, by the Negligence of the *Printers*: And therefore, *Censuit atque Decrevit*, both *Judg'd and Decreed* to have the whole Work *Examin'd and Reprinted*; but that second Correction being prevented by his Death, was (after the very short Reign of Three other *Popes*) undertaken, and happily finish'd by his Successor *Clement VIII.* answerable to the Desire and absolute Intention of his Predecessor, *Sixtus*: Whence it is, that the *Vulgata* now extant, is call'd the Correction of *Sixtus*, because this Vigilant Pope, notwithstanding the endeavours of his Two Predecessors, is said to have begun it, which was according to his desire *Recogniz'd and Perfected* by *Clement VIII.* and therefore is not undeservedly call'd also the *Clementine Bible*: So that Pope *Sixtus's Bible*, after *Clement's* Recognition, is now Read in the Church, as Authentick True Scripture; and is the very best Corrected Copy in the *Latin Vulgata*.

And whereas, Pope *Sixtus's Bull* enjoyn'd that his *Bible* be read in all Churches, without the least Alteration; yet this Injunction suppos'd the *Interpreters and Printers* to have done exactly their Duty every way, which was found wanting upon a second review of the whole Work. Such Commands and Injunctions therefore, where new difficulties arise (not thought of before) are not like Definitions of *Faith*, *unalterable*, but may and ought to be chang'd according to the Legislator's Prudence. What I say here is indisputable; for how could Pope *Sixtus*, after a sight of such Faults as caus'd him to Intend another Impression, enjoyn no Alteration, when he desir'd One, which his Successor did for him: So that if Pope *Sixtus* had liv'd longer, he would as well have chang'd the *Breve*, as amended his Impression.

And whereas there were sundry different Lectons of the *Vulgar Latin*, before the said Correction of *Sixtus* and *Clement*, the worthy Doctors of *Lovain*, with an Immense Labour, plac'd in the Margent of their *Bible* these different Lectons of Scripture; not determining which Reading was best, or to be preferr'd before others; as knowing well, that the decision of such Causes belongs to the publick Judicature and Authority of the Church. Pope *Clement* therefore omitting no Humane Diligence, compar'd Lecture with Lecture; and after mature weighing all, preferr'd that which was most agreeable to the Ancient Copies, a thing necessary to be done for the procuring One Uniform Lecture of Scripture in the Church, approv'd on by the See Apostolick.--- And from this arises that Vilanous Calumny and open Slander of Dr. *Stillingfleet*; who affirms, *That the Pope took where he pleas'd the Marginal Annotations in the Lovain Bible, and Inserted them into the Text*: Whereas (I say) he took not the *Annotations* or *Commentaries* of the *Lovain* Doctors, but the different Readings of Scripture found in several Copies.

Mr. James makes a great deal of Noise with his Impertinent Comparisons between these Two Editions, and that of *Lovain*: Yet among all his Differences he finds not One Contrariety in any material point of Faith or Manners: And as for other Differences, such as touch not Faith and Religion, arising from the Expressions, being longer or shorter, less clear in the One, and more significant in the Other; or happening thro' the Negligence of Printers, they give him no manner of ground for his vain Cavils; especially seeing (I say) the *Lovain* Bible gave the different Readings, without determining which was to be preferr'd; and what Faults were slipt into the *Sixtine* Edition were by him Observ'd, and a Second Correction design'd; which in the *Clementine* Edition was Perfected, and one Uniform Reading approv'd on.

Against Thomas James's Comparisons, read the Learned James Gretser, who sufficiently discovers his Untruths, with a *Mentito tertio* Thomas James *decem milia verborum*, &c. after which, Judge whether he hits every thing he says; and whether the *Vulgar Latin* is to be Corrected by the *Lovain Annotations*, or these by the *Vulgar*, if any thing were amiss in either? In fine, whether, If Mr. James's pretended Differences arise from comparing All with the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Caldee*, Must we needs suppose him to know the last Energy and force of every *Hebrew*, *Greek*, or *Caldee* Word (when there's Controversie) better than the Authors of the *Lovain*, and Correctors of the *Vulgar Latin* [the *Sixtine-Clementine* Edition.] Again, Let us demand of him, Whether all his Differences imply any material Alteration in Faith or Manners, or Introduce any notable Error, contrary to GOD's Revealed Verities: or are rather meer verbal Differences, grounded on the obscure signification of Original Words. In fine, if he, or any for him, plead any material Alteration, let them name any Authentick Copy, either Original or Translation; by the indisputable Integrity whereof these supposed Errors may be Cancell'd, and GOD's pure Reveald Verities put in their place. But to do this, after so Immense Labour and Diligence us'd in the Correction of the *Vulgar*, will prove a desperate Impossibility.

Indeed Mr. James might have had just cause to exclaim if he had found in these Bibles such Corruptions, as the Protestant Apostle, Martin Luther, wilfully makes in his Translations: As when he adds the word [ALONE] to the Text, to maintain his Heresie of Faith alone Justifying; and omits that Verse, [But if you do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in Heaven, forgive your Sins:] He also omits these words, [That you abstain from Fornication:] And because the word Trinity sounded coldly with him, he left out this Sentence, which is the only Text in the Bible that can be brought to prove that Great Mystery, [There are Three who bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One.] Or if Mr. James had found such gross Corruptions, as that of Zuinglius, when instead of our Blessed Saviours positive words, [This is my Body,] he translates, This is a Sign of my Body, to avoid the Doctrine of the Real Presence; or such as are hereafter discover'd in Protestant English Translations: If, I say, he had met with such wilful and abominable Corruptions as these, he might have had good cause of Complaint: But seeing the most, he can make of all his painful Comparisons, comes but to this, viz. That he notes such Faults, as Sixtus himself observ'd, after the Impression was finish'd, and as Clement Rectify'd: I think he might have better employ'd his Time in Correcting the gross, and most intollerable Corruptions of the Protestant Translation, than to have busied himself about so unnecessary a Work: But there are a certain sort of Men, that had rather employ themselves in discovering imaginary Moles in their Neighbours Eyes, than in clearing their own from real Beams.

See the Preface to Sixtus V. Edit. Antwerp. 1599. And Bib. max. Scilicet. 19. 20. Serarius 4. 19.

Rom. 3. 28.

Mark 11. 26.

1 Thes. 4. 3.

1 John 5. 7.

We must of necessity know the True Church, before we be certain either which is True Scripture, or which is the True sense of Scripture; Or by what Spirit is it to be Expounded. And whether that CHURCH which has continu'd Visible in the World from Christ's Time till this day, Or that which was never known or heard of in the World till 1500 Years after our Saviour, is the True Church, let the World judge.

To conclude this Point, No Man can be certainly assured of true *Scripture*, unless he first come to a Certainty of a *True Church*, independently of *Scripture*: Find out therefore the *True Church*, and we know, by the Authority of her undoubted Testimony, the *True Scripture*; for the Infalible Testimony of the *Church* is absolutely necessary to assure us of *Authentick Scripture*. And Thus I cannot see how *Protestants* can deny, especially when they seriously consider, that in Matters of Religion, it must needs be an unreasonable thing to endeavour to oblige any Man to be Try'd by the *Scriptures* of a *False Religion*: For who can in Prudence require of a *Christian* to stand in debates of *Religion* to the decisions of the *Scripture* of the *Turks*, [the *Alcharon*.] Doubtless therefore, when Men Appeal to *Scripture* for determining *Religious Differences* their Intention is to Appeal to such *Scriptures*, and such alone, and to All such as are admitted by the *True Church*: And how can we know, what *Scriptures* are admitted by the *True Church*, unless we know, which is the *True Church*?

So likewise, touching the Exposition of *Scripture*, without doubt when *Protestants* fly to *Scriptures* for their *Rule*, whereby to square their *Religion*, and to decide *Debates* between them and their *Adversaries*, they Appeal to *Scriptures* as *rightly Understood*: For who would be Try'd by *Scriptures* understood in a *wrong Sense*? Now when *Contentions* arise between Them and Others of Differing Judgments concerning the *Right Meaning* of it; certainly they will not deny, but the Judge to decide this *Debate* must appertain to the *True Religion*: For what *Christian* will apply himself to a *Turk* or *Jew* to decide matters belonging to *Christianity*? Or who will go to an *Atheist* to determine matters of *Religion*?

In like manner, when they are forc'd to have recourse to the *Private Spirit* in Religious Matters, doubtless they design not to Appeal to the *Private Spirit* of an *Atheist*, a *Jew*, or an *Heretick*, but to the *Private Spirit* of such as are of the *True Religion*: And is it possible for them to know certainly who are Members of the *True Church*? Or what appertains to the *True Religion*, unless they be certainly Inform'd, Which the *True Church* is? So that, I say, no Man can be certainly assur'd, Which, or What Books, or How much is *True Scripture*; Or of the *Right Sense*, and *True Meaning* of *Scripture*, unless he first come to a certainty of the *True Church*. And of this Opinion was the Great St. *Augustin*, when he declar'd, That he would not believe the Gospel, if it was not, that the Authority of the *Catholick Church* moved him to it: Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesie Catholice commoveret Autoritas. S. Aug. lib. contr. Epist. Manich. cap. 5.

Of Canonical Books of Scripture.

Council. Tri-
dent. Sess. 4.
Decret de
Canonicis
Scripturis.

Mark. c. ult.

THE *Catholick Church* setting always this before her Eyes, That Errors being taken away, the very purity of the Gospel may be preserv'd in the Church: What was promis'd before by the Prophets, in the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus CHRIST, the Son of GOD, first publish'd by his own Mouth; and afterwards commanded to be Preach'd to every Creature, by the Apostles, as the Fountain of all wholesome Truth, and of the Discipline, is contain'd in the WRITTEN BOOKS, and in the TRADITIONS NOT WRITTEN, &c. Following the Example of Orthodoxal Fathers, with the Affection of Piety and Reverence; it receives and Honours all the Books both of the Old and New Te-

stament

ament, seeing One GOD is the Author of Both, &c. These are the words of the Sacred Council of Trent; which further ordain'd, that the Table (or Catalogue) of the Canonical Books should be joyn'd to this Decree, lest doubt might arise to any, which Books they are that are receiv'd by the Synod. They are these following, viz.

Of the Old Testament.

FIVE Books of *Moses*; that is, *Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.*

Josbua, Judges, Ruth.

Four of the *Kings.*

Two of *Paralipomenon.*

The First and Second of *Esdras*, which is call'd *Nehemias.*

Tobias, Judith, Hester, Job, David's Psalter of 150 Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus. Isaías, Hieremias with Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel.

Twelve lesser Prophets; that is, *Osea, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Michæas, Nahum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias.*

The First and Second of the *Macchabees.*

Of the New Testament.

FOUR Gospels, according to *St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John.*

The *Acts of the Apostles*, written by *St. Luke* the Evangelist.

Fourteen Epistles of *St. Paul*, viz. to the *Romans*, Two to the *Corinthians*, to the *Galathians*, to the *Ephesians*, to the *Philippians*, to the *Colossians*, Two to the *Thessalonians*, Two to *Timothy*, to *Titus*, to *Philemon*, to the *Hebrews.*

Two of *St. Peter* the Apostle.

Three of *St. John* the Apostle.

One of *St. James* the Apostle.

One of *St. Jude* the Apostle.

And the *Apocalyps* of *St. John* the Apostle.

To which Catalogue of Sacred Books is adjoyn'd this Decree:

But if any Man shall not Receive for Sacred and Canonical these whole Books, with all their Parts, as they are accusom'd to be read in the Catholick Church, and as they are in the Old Vulgar Latin Edition, &c. Be he Anathema.

The Third Council of *Carthage*, after having Decreed, That nothing should be read in the Church under the Name of *Divine Scriptures*, but *Canonical Scriptures*, says, *That the Canonical Scriptures are Genesis, Exodus, &c.* so reckoning up all the very same Books, and making particularly the same Catalogue of them, with This recited out of the Council of *Trent*. *St. Augustin*, who was present at, and Subscrib'd to this Council, also numbers the same Books as above; *Vid. Doctr. Christian, Lib. II. cap. 8.*

Notwithstanding which, several of the said Books are by the Protestants rejected as *Apochryphal*; their Reasons are, because they are not in the *Jews Canon*, nor were accepted for Canonical in the *Primitive Church*; Reasons by which they might reject a great many more, if it pleas'd them: But indeed the chief Cause is, That some things in these Books are so manifestly against their Opinions, that they have no other Answer but to reject their Authority; as appears very plainly from these Words of *Mr. Whitakers*: *We pass not, says he, for that Raphael mentioned in Tobit, neither acknowledge we these Seven Angels whereof he makes mention; All That differs much from Canonical Scripture, which is reported of that Raphael, and favours of I know not what Superstition. Neither will I believe Free-Will, altho' the Book of Ecclesiasticus confirm it an*

S. Aug. lib. de
Prædest.
Sanct. c. 24.

S. Aug. lib.
11. c. 5. con-
tra Faustum
& lib. 2. c. 32.
contra Cref-
conium.

hundred Times. This denying of Books to be Canonical, because the Jews received them not, was also an old Heretical Shift, noted and refuted by St. *Augustin*, touching the Book of *Wisdom*; which some in his Time refus'd, because it convinc'd their Errors: But must it pass for a sufficient Reason amongst Christians to deny such Books, because they are not in the Canon of the Jews? Who sees not that the Canon of the Church of *CHRIST* is of more Authority with all true Christians, than that of the Jews? For a Canon is an assured Rule, and warrant of Direction; whereby (says St. *Augustin*) the Infirmitie of our defect in Knowledge is guided, and by which Rule other Books are known to be GOD's Word: His Reason is, Because we have no other Assurance that the Books of *Moses*, the *Four Gospels*; and other Books, are the True Word of GOD, but by the Canon of the Church. Whereupon the same Great Doctor utter'd that Famous saying; I would not believe the Gospel, except the Authority of the Catholick Church mov'd me thereunto.

And that these Books which Protestants reject, are by the Church number'd in the Sacred Canon, may be seen above: However to speak of them, in particular, in their Order,

The Book of Tobias

S. Amb. lib.
de Tobias c. 1.

Lib. 3. Offic.
c. 24.

3. Aug. Serm.

2:6. de Temp.

S. Chrysost.

Hom. 15. ad

Heb.

S. Greg. part.

3. Pastor. cu-

admon. 21.

IS by St. *Cyprian*, de *Oratione Dominica*, alleadg'd as Divine Scripture, to prove that Prayer is good with Fasting and Alms. St. *Ambrose* calls this Book by the common name of *Scripture*; saying, He will briefly gather the Virtues of Tobias, which the Scripture in Historical manner lays forth at large: Calling also this History Prophetical, and Tobias a Prophet: And in another place, alleadges this Book as he does other Holy Scriptures, to prove that the Vertues of GOD's Servants far excel the Moral Philosophers. St. *Augustin* made a special Sermon of Tobias, as he did of *Job*. St. *Chrysostome* alleadg'd it as Scripture, denouncing a Curse to the Contemners of it. St. *Gregory* also alleadges it as Holy Scripture. St. *Bede* expounds the whole Book Mystically, as he does other Holy Scriptures. St. *Hierom* translates it of the Caldee Language, judging it more meet to displease the Pharisaical Jews who reject it, than not to satisfy the Will of Holy Bishops, urging to have it. Ep ad Chromat. & Heliodorum. To. 3. In fine, St. *Augustin* telling us the Cause of its being writ, has these words, --- The Servant of GOD, Holy Tobias, is given to us after the Law, for an Example, that we might know how to Practise the things which we read. And if Temptations come upon us, not to depart from the Fear of GOD, nor expect help from any other than from Him.

Of the Book of Judith.

See the Argu-
ment of the
Book of Ju-
dith in the
Downy Bible
Tq. 1.

THIS Book was by *Origen*, *Tertullian*, and other Fathers, whom St. *Hilary* cites, held for Canonical, before the first General Council of Nice; yet St. *Hierom* supposed it not so, till such time as he found that the said Sacred Council reckon'd it in the number of Canonical Scriptures; after which he so esteemed it, that he not only translated it out of the Caldee Tongue, wherein 'twas first written, but also as occasion requir'd, cited the same as Divine Scripture, and sufficient to convince Matters of Faith in Controversie; numbring it with other Scriptures, whereof none doubts, saying, *Ruth*, *Hester*, *Judith*, were of so great Renown, that they gave the Names to Sacred Volumes. St. *Ambrose*, St. *Augustin*, St. *Chrysostome*, and many other Holy Fathers, account it for Canonical Scripture.

Part of the Book of Hester.

BY the Councils of *Laodicea* and *Carthage*, this Book was declar'd Canonical; and by most of the Ancient Fathers esteem'd as *Divine Scripture*; only Two or Three before the said Councils, doubted of its Authority. And tho' *St. Hierom* in his Time, found not certain parts thereof in the *Hebrew*, yet in the *Greek* he found all the sixteen Chapters contain'd in Ten: And 'tis not improbable that these parcels were sometimes in the *Hebrew*, as divers whole Books which are now lost. But whether they ever were so or no, the Church of *CHRIST* accounts the whole Book of Infallible Authority, reading as well these parts as the rest in her publick Office.

100. Doway Bible, To. 1

Of the Books of Wisdom.

IT is granted, that several of the Ancient Fathers would not urge these Books of *Wisdom*, and others, in their Writings against the *Jews*, not that themselves doubted of their Authority, but because they knew that they would be rejected by the *Jews* as not Canonical: And so *St. Hierom*, in respect of the *Jews*, said these Books were not Canonical; nevertheless, he often alleadg'd Testimonies out of them, as of other *Divine Scriptures*; sometimes with this Parenthesis (*Si cui tamen placet librum recipere*) in cap. 8. and 12. *Zacharie*: but in his latter Writings absolutely without any such restriction, as in cap. 1. & 56. *Isaie*. & in 18. *Jeremie*, where he professes to alleadge none but Canonical Scripture. As for the other Ancient Fathers, namely, *St. Irenaeus*, *St. Clement of Alexandria*, *Origen*, *St. Athanasius*, *St. Basil*, *St. Gregory Nazianzen*, *St. Gregory Nyssen*, *St. Epiphanius*, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, *St. Chrysostome*, *St. Ambrose*, &c. they make no doubt at all of their being *Canonical Scripture*, as appears by their express tearms [*Divine Scripture*, *Divine Word*, *Sacred Letters*, *Prophetical saying*, *The Holy Ghost saith*, and the like.] And *St. Augustin* affirms, that, *The Sentence of the Book of Wisdom ought not to be rejected*, (by certain inclining to Pelagianism) *which has so long been publicly read in the Church of Christ, and receiv'd of all Christians, Bishops, and others, even to the last of the Laity, Penitents and Catichumens, cum Veneratione Divinae Autoritatis, with Veneration of Divine Authority: Which also the excellent Writers, next to the Apostles Times, alleadging for Witnests, (Nihil se adhibere nisi Divinum testimonium crediderunt) thought they alleadg'd nothing but Divine Testimony.*

Vid. Doway Bible, To. 2. And. Jodoc. Cocc. To. 1. Theauri li. 6. Art. 9.

S. Aug. in lib. de Prædestinat. Sanct. cap. 14. Et lib. de Civ. Dei. 17. c. 20.

Of Ecclesiasticus.

What has been said of the foregoing Book, the same may be said also of this. The Holy Fathers above-named, and several others, as *St. Cyprian*, *de opere & Eleemosina*, *St. Gregory the Great*, in *Psal. 50*. 'Tis also reckon'd for Canonical by the Third Council of *Carthage*, and by *St. Augustin*, in *lib. 2. c. 8. Doct. Christian. & lib. 17. c. 20. Civit. Dei*.

Of Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremy.

Many of the Ancient Fathers suppos'd this Prophecy to be *Jeremie's*, tho' none of them doubted but *Baruch* his Scribe was the Writer of it; nor but that the Holy Ghost directed him in it: And therefore, by the Fathers and Councils, it has ever

See the Argument of Baruch's Prophecy in the Doway Bible, To. 2.

S. Hierom in
Præfat. Jeremia.

been accepted as Divine Scripture. The Council of *Laodicea*, in the last Canon, expressly Names *Baruch*, *Lamentations*, and *Jeremiah's Epistle*. St. *Hierom* testifies, That he found it in the *Vulgar. Latin* Edition, and that it contains many things of *CHRIST*, and the latter Times; tho' because he found it not in the *Hebrew*, nor in the *Jews Canon*, he urges it not against Them. It is by the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent* expressly defin'd to be Canonical Scripture.

Of the Song of the Three Children, the Idol, Bell and Dragon, with the Story of Susanna.

S. Hier. lib. 2.
c. 9. advers.
Ruffinum.

IT is no just Exception against these and other parts of Holy Scripture of the *Old Testament* to say, they are not in the *Hebrew* Edition, being otherwise accepted for Canonical by the Catholick Church: And further, 'tis very probable, that these parcels were sometimes either in the *Hebrew* or *Caldee*, (in which Two Languages, part in one, and part in the other, the rest of the Book of *Daniel* was written) for from whence could the *Septuagint*, *Theodotion*, *Symmachus*, and *Aquila* translate them? in whose Editions St. *Hierom* found them. But if it be Objected, that St. *Hierom* calls them Fables, and so did not account them Canonical Scripture: We Answer, that he reporting the *Jews* Opinion, uses their terms, not explaining his own Judgment, intending to deliver sincerely that which he found in the *Hebrew*: Yet would he not omit to Insert the rest, advertising withal, that he had it in *Theodotians* Translation; which Answer is clearly justify'd by his own Testimony, in these words:—Whereas I relate (says he) what the *Hebrews* say against the Hymn of the Three Children; he that for this reputes me a Fool, proves himself a Sycophant; for I did not write what my self judged, but what they are accusom'd to say against me.

Vid. Doway
Bible, To. 2.

The Prayer of *Azarias* is alleadg'd as Divine Scripture by St. *Cyprian*, St. *Ephrem*, St. *Chrysostome*, St. *Augustin*, St. *Fulgentius*, and others. The Hymn of the Three Children is alleadg'd for Divine Scripture by divers Holy Fathers, as also by St. *Hierom* himself, in cap. 3. ad *Gallatus* & *Epist.* 49. de *Muliere Septies ita*; also by St. *Ambrose*, and the Council of *Toleta*, c. 13.

So likewise the History of *Susanna* is cited for Holy Scripture by St. *Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian*, St. *Chrysostome*, who in *Hom.* 7. *fine*, has a whole Sermon of *Susanna*, as upon Holy Scripture: St. *Ambrose* and St. *Augustin*, cite the same also as Canonical.

The History of *Bell* and the *Dragon* are judg'd Divine Scripture, St. *Cyprian*, St. *Basil*, and St. *Athanasius*, in *Synopsi*, briefly explicating the Argument of the Book of *Daniel*, makes express mention of the Hymn of the Three Children, of the History of *Susanna*, and of *Bell* and the *Dragon*.

Of the Two Books of Maccabees.

EVER since the Third Council of *Carthage*, these Two Books of the *Maccabees* have been held for Sacred and Canonical by the Catholick Church, as is prov'd by a Council of Seventy Bishops, under Pope *Gelasius*; and by the Sixth General Council, in approving the Third of *Carthage*; as also by the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent*.

But

But because some of the Church of England Divines would seem to make their People believe, that the *Maccabees* were not receiv'd for Canonical Scripture in *Gregory the Great's* Time (consequently not before,) I will, besides these Councils, refer you to the Holy Fathers, who liv'd before *St. Gregory's* Days, and alledg'd these Two Books of the *Maccabees* as Divine Scripture: Namely, *St. Clement Alexandrinus*, lib. 1. *Stromat.* *St. Cyprian*, lib. 1. *Epistolarum* Ep. 3. ad *Cornelium*, lib. 4. Ep. 1. & de *Exhort.* ad *Martyrium* c. 11. *St. Isidorus*, lib. 16. c. 1. *St. Gregory Nazianzen* has also a whole Oration concerning the Seven *Maccabees* Martyrs, and their Mother. *St. Ambros.* lib. 1. c. 41. *Offic.* See in *St. Hierom's* Commentaries upon *Daniel*, c. 1. 11, and 12. in how great esteem he had these Books; tho, because he knew they were not in the *Jewish Canon*, he would not urge them against the *Jews*. And the Great Doctor *St. Augustin*, in lib. 2. c. 8. de *Doctrina Christiana*, & lib. 18. c. 36. de *Civit. Dei*, most clearly avouches, that, *Notwithstanding the Jews deny these Books, the Church holds them Canonical.* And whereas one *Gaudentius* an Heretick, alledg'd, for defence of his Heresie, the Example of *Razias*, who slew himself (2 *Mac.* 14.) *St. Augustin* denies not the Authority of the Book, but discusses the Fact, and admonishes, that it is not unprofitably receiv'd by the Church, *If it be Read or Heard soberly*, which was a necessary Admonition to those *Donatists*, who, not understanding the Holy Scriptures, deprav'd them (as *St. Peter* says of like Hereticks) to their own Perdition. Which Testimonies, I think, may be sufficient to satisfy any one who is not Pertinacious and Obstinate, that these Two Books of the *Maccabees* (as well as others in the *New-Testament*) were receiv'd, and held for Canonical Scripture, long before *St. Gregory the Great's* Time.

See the Second Vindication of the Exposition of the Doctrin of the Church of England.

Judge now, Good Reader, Whether the Author of the *Second Vindication*, &c. has not Impos'd upon the World in this point of the Books of *Maccabees*. And indeed if this were all the Cheat he endeavours to put upon us, it were well, but he goes yet further, and names Eleven points of Doctrine besides this, which he (with his Fellows, quoted in his Margent) falsely affirms not to have been Taught in England by *St. Augustin* the *Benedictine Monk*, when he Converted our Nation. Telling us, *That the Mystery of Iniquity* (as he Blasphemously terms the Doctrine of *CHRIST's* Holy Church) *was not then come to perfection.* For First, (says he) *The Scripture was yet receiv'd as a perfect Rule of Faith.* Secondly, *The Books of the Maccabees, which you now put in your Canon, were rejected then as Apochryphal.* Thirdly, *That Good-Works were not yet esteem'd Meritorious.* Fourthly, *Nor Auricular Confession a Sacrament.* Fifthly, *That Solitary Masses were disallow'd by him.* And Sixthly, *Transubstantiation yet unborn.* Seventhly, *That the Sacrament of the Eucharist was hitherto Administred in Both kinds, (What then? so it was also in One kind.)* Eighthly, *Purgatory is self not brought either to Certainty or to Perfection.* Ninthly, *That by consequence Masses for the Dead were not intended to deliver Souls from these Torments.* Tenthly, *Nor Images allow'd for any other purpose than for Ornament and Instruction.* Eleventhly, *That the Sacrament of Extream-Union was yet unform'd, (then you must, with your Master Luther, count St. James's Epistle, an Epistle of Straw.)* Twelvethly, *And even the Popes Supremacy so far from being then Establish'd as it now is, That Pope Gregory thought it to be the fore-runner of Antichrist for one Bishop to set himself above all the rest.*

I will only, in particular, take notice here of this last of his false Instances, because he cites and mis-applies the words of *St. Gregory the Great*, to the deluding of his Reader: Whereas *St. Gregory* did not think it Antichristian or Unlawful for the Pope, whom (not himself, but) our Saviour *CHRIST* had set and appointed (in the Person of *St.*

Andreas Frickius de Ecclesiis l. 2. c. 10. pag. 579.

Peter) above all the rest, to exercise Spiritual Supremacy and Jurisdiction over all the Bishops in the Christian World: But he thought it Antichristian for any Bishop to set up himself, as *John* Bishop of *Constantinople* had done, by the Name or Title of *Universal Bishop*, so as if he alone were the *Sole Bishop*, and none Bishop but he in the Universe: And in this Sense *St. Gregory* thought this Name or Title not only worthily forborn in his Predecessors, and by himself, but terms it *Prophane*, *Sacrilegious*, and *Antichristian*; and in this Sense the Bishops of *Rome* have always utterly renounc'd the Title of *Universal Bishop*; on the contrary, terming themselves *Servi Servorum Dei*. And this is prov'd from the words of *Andreas Frickius* a Protestant, (whom *Peter Martar* terms an excellent Learned Man) Some there are, says he, that Object the Authority of *Gregory*, who says, That such a Title pertains to the Precursor of Antichrist; but the reason of *Gregory* is to be known, and it may be gather'd of his Words, which he repeats in many Epistles, That the Title of *Universal Bishop* is contrary to, and doth gain-say the Grace which is commonly pour'd upon all Bishops; He therefore who calls himself the ONLY Bishop, takes the Episcopal Power from the rest: Wherefore this Title he would have to be reject-ed, &c. But it is nevertheless evident by other places, That *Gregory* thought that the Charge and Principallity of the whole Church was committed to *Peter*, &c. And yet for this Cause *Gregory* thought not that *Peter* was the Fore-runner of Antichrist. Thus evidently and clearly this Protestant Writer explains this difficulty.

Centur. 6 Col. 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 438.

To this may be added the Testimonies of other Protestants, who, from the Writings of *St. Gregory*, clearly prove the Bishop of *Rome* to have had and exercis'd Power and Jurisdiction, not only over the *Greek*, but over the *Universal Church*. The *Magdeburgian* Centurists shew us, that the *Roman See* appoints her Watch over the whole World; that the *Apostolick See* is Head of all Churches; that even *Constantinople* is subject to the *Apostolick See*. These Centurists charge more-over the Bishop of *Rome*, in the very Example and Person of *Pope Gregory*, and by Collection out of his Writings, by them particularly alleadg'd, That he challeng'd to himself Power to Command all Arch-Bishops, to Ordain and Depose Bishops at his Pleasure. And, That he claim'd a Right to cite Arch-Bishops, to declare their Cause before him, when they were accus'd. And also, To Excommunicate and Depose them, giving Commission to their Neighbour Bishops to proceed against them. That, In their Provinces he plac'd his Legates to Know and End the Causes of such as appeal'd to the See of *Rome*: With much more touching the Exercise of his Supremacy. To which *Dr. Saunders* adds yet more out of *St. Gregory's* own Works, and in his own Words, as, That the See *Apostolick*, by the Authority of *GOD*, is prefer'd before all Churches. That all Bishops, if any Fault be found in them, are subject to the See *Apostolick*. That She is the Head of Faith, and of all the Faithful Members. That the See *Apostolick* is the Head of all Churches. That the *Roman Church*, by the Words which *CHRIST* spake to *Peter*, was made the Head of all Churches. That no scruple or doubt ought to be made of the Faith of the See *Apostolick*. That all those things are False, which are Taught contrary to the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*. That to return from Schism to the *Catholick Church*, is to return to the Communion of the Bishops of *Rome*. That he who will not have *St. Peter* (to whom the Keys of Heaven were committed) to shut him out from the entrance of Life, must not in this World be separated from his See. That they are perverse Men who refuse to Obey the See *Apostolick*.

Dr. Saund. l'istb. Monar. li. 7. a N. 433, 511.

All these Words of *Pope Gregory* consider'd, Does not this *Vindicator* of the Church of *England's* Doctrine shew himself a Grand Impostor, to offer to the abus'd Judgment of his unlearned Readers, an Objection so frivolous and misapply'd, upon the advantage only of a naked sounding resemblance of mistaken Words? To conclude therefore in the

the

the words of Dr. Saunders: *He who reads all these particulars, and more of the same kind that are to be found in the Works of St. Gregory, and yet with a Brazen Forehead, fears not to Interpret that which he writ against the Name of Universal Bishop, so, as if he could not abide that any One Bishop should have the Chief Seat, and Supreme Government of the whole Militant Church; That Man (says he) seems to me either to have cast off all understanding and Sense of a Man, or else to have put on the obstinate perverseness of the Devil.*

'Tis not my Business, in this place, to digress into particular Replies against his other false Instances * of the Difference between Pope Gregory the Great's Doctrine, and That of the Council of Trent: I will therefore in general oppose the Words of a Protestant Bishop, against this Protestant Ministerial Guide, and to remit them to the Consideration of the Judicious Reader.

John Bale, a Protestant Bishop, affirms; *That the Religion preach'd by St. Augustin to the Saxons, was Altars, Vestments, Images, Chalices, Crosses, Censers, Holy Vessels, Holy Water, the Sprinkling thereof, Reliques, Translation of Reliques, Dedicating of Churches to the Bones and Ashes of Saints, Consecration of Altars, Chalices and Corporals, Consecration of the Font of Baptism, Chrysm, and Oyl, Celebration of Mass, the Archi-episcopal Pall at Solemn Mass-time, Romish Mass-Books; also Free-Will, Merit, Justification of Works, Penance, Satisfaction, Purgatory, the Unmarry'd Life of Priests, the Publick Invocation of Saints, and their Worship, the Worship of Images, (In another Place he says, That Pope Leo the First decreed, That Men should Worship the Images of the Dead, and allow'd the Sacrifice of the Mass,) Exorcism, Pardons, Vows, Monachism, Transubstantiation, Prayer for the Dead, Offering of the Healthful Host of CHRIST's Body and Blood for the Dead, the Roman Bishop's Claim and Exercise of Jurisdiction and Supremacy over all Churches, (Reliquium Pontificæ Superstitionis Chaos) even the whole Chaos of Popish Superstitions. He tells us, That Pope Innocent (who liv'd long before St. Gregory's Time) made the Anointing of the Sick to be a Sacrament.*

These are Bishop Bale's Words; which this Indicator would do well to Reconcile with his Own. The like may be found in other Protestants; namely, in Dr. Humphrey in *Jesuitismi*, Part II. The *Centurists*, &c.

But now to return to the Place where we occasionally enter'd into this Digression: You see by what Authority and Testimonies both of Councils and Fathers, we have prov'd these Books, which Protestants reject, to be Canonical: Yet, if a Thousand times more were said, it would be all the same with the perverse Novellists of our Age, who are resolv'd to be obstinate, and (after their bold and Licentious manner) to receive or reject what they please; still following the Steps of their first Masters, who tore out of the Bible, some One Book, some Another, as they found them contrary to their Erroneous and Heretical Opinions. For Example:

Whereas *Moyse* was the First that ever writ any Part of the Scripture, and He who writ the Law of GOD, [The Ten Commandments;] yet *Luther* thus rejects both Him, and his Ten Commandments: --- (a) *We will neither hear nor see Moyse, for he was given only to the Jews; neither does he belong any thing to us.* --- I (says he) will not receive (b) *Moses with his Law; for he is the Enemy of CHRIST.* (c) *Moyse is the Master of all Hang-men.* (d) *The Ten Commandments belong not to Christians.* (e) *Let the Ten Commandments be altogether rejected, and all Heresie will presently cease; for the Ten Commandments are, as it were, the Fountain from whence all Heresies spring.*

Dr. Saunders
supra.

* You'll find
some of them
hinted at in
other places as
occasion offers

Bale in A. 2.
Rom. Pontif.
Edit. Basil.
1558. p. 44.
45, 46, 47. &
Cent. I. Col.
32

Pageant of
Pope, fol. 27.

Pageant of
Pope, fol. 26.

(a) Tom. 3.
Germ. fol. 40.
41. & in Col-
loq. Mensal.
Ger. fol. 152.
153.
(b) In Colloq.
Mensal. c. de
Leg. & Evan.
(c) Ibid. fol.
118.
(d) Sum. de
May.
(e) In Censu-
ral Colloq.
cited by Au-
gustin, c. p. de
Leg.

(f) See *Ofian-*
der, Cent. 16.
p. 311, 312,
320.

(g) *Sleidan*
Hist. l. 12.
fol. 162.

(h) Vid. Con-
fessio. *Mans-*
field-ensuin
Ministrorum
Tir. de Anti-
nomis, fol. 89,
90.

(i) In *Serm.*
Convival.
Tir. de Patri-
arch. & Prop-
het. & Tir. de
libris Vet.
& Nov. Test.

(k) Vid. *Bez.*
in Vita Cal-
vini.

(l) *Pomeran.*
ad Rom. c. 8.

(m) In *Annot.*
in Nov. Test.
pag. uk.

(n) *Cent. I.*
l. 2. c. 4.
Col. 54.

(o) *Instit.* l. 2.
c. 16.

In *Marth.* 27.
g. *Harm.* in
Marth. 20. 16.

(p) *Victoria*
veritatis & ru-
ina Papasus,
Arg. 5.

(q) *Tom.* 2.
Eleach. f. 10.
Magdeburg.
Cent. I. l. 2.
c. 10. *Col.*
580.

(r) *Defence*
of the 39 Ar-
ticles, Art. 6.

The Private
Spirit (not the
Church) told
those Prote-
stants who
made the 39
Articles, what
Books of Scri-
pture they
were to hold
for Canonical.

Islebius, Luther's Scholar, taught, (f) *That the Decalogue was not to be taught in the Church: And from him came* (g) *the Sect of Antinomians; who publickly taught, that* (h) *The Law of GOD is not worthy to be call'd the Word of GOD: If thou art an Whore, if an Whoremonger, if an Adulterer, or otherwise a Sinner; Believe, And thou walk'st in the Way of Salvation. When thou art drown'd in Sin even to the bottom, if thou Believ'st, Thou art in the midst of Happiness. All that buse themselves about Moyfes, that is, the Ten Commandments, belong to the Devil, to the Gallows, with Moyfes.*

Martin Luther believes not all things to be so done, as they are related in the Book of *Job*: With him it is, (i) *as it were, the Argument of a Fable.*

Castalio (k) commanded the *Canticles of Solomon* to be thrust out of the *Canon*, as an Impure and Obscene Song; reviling, with bitter Reproaches, such Ministers as resisted him therein.

Pomerane, a great Evangelist among the Lutherans, writes thus touching *St. James's Epistles*: (l) *He concludes ridiculously, he cites Scripture against Scripture, which thing the Holy Ghost cannot abide; Wherefore that Epistle may not be number'd among other Books, which set forth the Justice of Faith.*

Vitus Theodorus, a Protestant-Preacher of *Norimberg*, writes thus: (m) *The Epistle of James, and Apocalyps of John we have of set-purpose left out, because the Epistle of James is not only in certain Places reprovab, where he too much advances Works against Faith; but also his Doctrine throughout is patcht together of divers Pieces, whereof no One agrees with Another.*

The *Magdeburgian Centurists* say, (n) *That the Epistle of James much swerves from the Analogy of the Apostolical Doctrine, whereas it ascribes Justification not to Only Faith, but to Works; and calls the Law, A Law of Liberty.*

John Calvin doubted (o) whether the *Apostles Creed* was made by the *Apostles*. He argu'd *St. Matthew* of Error. He rejected these Words, *Many are Call'd, but Few Chosen.*

Clebitius, (p) an Eminent Protestant, opposes the *Evangelists* one against another: *Matthew and Mark* (says he) *deliver the contrary; therefore to Matthew and Mark, being Two Witnesses, more Credit is to be given, than to One Luke, &c.*

Zuinglius, (q) and other Protestants, affirm, *That All things in St. Paul's Epistles are not Sacred; and that, In sundry things he Err'd.*

Mr. Rogers, the great Labourer to our *English Convocation-Men*, names several of his Protestant Brethren, (r) who rejected for Apocryphal, *The Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, of St. James, the First and Second of John, of Jude, and the Apocalyps.*

Thus, you see, these pretended Reformers have torne out some One Piece or Book of Sacred Scripture, some Another; with such a licentious Freedom, rejecting, deriding, discarding, and censuring them, that their Impiety can never be parallell'd but by profess'd Atheists. Yet all these Sacred Books were (as is said) Receiv'd for Canonical in the Third Council of *Carthage*, above Thirteen Hundred Years ago.

But with the *Church of England*, it matters not by what Authority Books are judg'd Canonical, if the Holy Spirit in the Hearts of her Children, testify them to be from GOD. They telling us (by *Mr. Rogers*,) *That They judge such and such Books Canonical, Not so much because Learned and Godly Men in the Church so have, and do receive and allow them, as for that the Holy Spirit in our Hearts doth testify, that they are from GOD.* By instinct of which [Private] Spirit in their Hearts, they decreed as many as they thought good for Canonical, and Rejected the rest; as you may see in the VI of the XXXIX Articles.

Of such Books as Protestants call Apochrypha.

21

THe Church of England has decreed, * That such are to be understood Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose Authority was never any doubt in the Church: And therefore, by this Rule, She rejects these for Apochryphal, viz.

Tobit.	}	Baruch, with the Epistle of	}	I. Maccabees.	}
Judeth.		Jeremiah.		II. Maccabees.	
The rest of Esther.		The Song of the Three Children.		The Prayer of Manasse.	
Wisdom.		The Idol, Bell and the Dragon.		III. Esdras.	
Ecclesiasticus.		The Story of Susanna.		IV. Esdras.	

BUt, if none must pass for Canonical, but such as were never doubted of in the Church, I would know, why the Ch. of Eng. admits of such Books of the New Testament, as have formerly been doubted of? Some Ancient Writers doubted of the Last Chap. of St. Mark's Gospel (a): Others of some part of the 22. of St. Luke (b): Some of the Beginning of the 8. of St. John (c): Others of the Epistle to the Hebrews (d): And Others (e) of the Ep. of St. James, Jude, the Second of Peter, the Second and Third of John, and the Apocalyps.

And Dr. Bilson, a Protestant, affirms, That the Scriptures were not fully received in all Places, no, not in Eusebius's Time. He says, The Epistles of James, Jude, the Second of Peter, the Second and Third of John, are contradicted, as not Written by the Apostles. The Epistle to the Hebrews was for a while contradicted, &c. The Churches of Syria did not receive the Second Epistle of Peter, nor the Second and Third of John; nor the Epistle of Jude, nor the Apocalyps. The like might be said for the Churches of Arabia: Will you hence conclude, says this Doctor, That these parts of Scripture were not Apostolick, or that we need not to receive them Now, because they were Formerly doubted of? Thus Dr. Bilson. (f)

And Mr. Rogers (g) confesses, That although some of the Ancient Fathers and Doctors accepted not all the Books contained in the New Testament for Canonical: Yet in the End, they were wholly Taken, and Received by the common Consent of the Church of Christ, in this World, for the very Word of God, &c.

And, by Mr. Rogers's, and the Church of England's leave, so were also these Books, which they call Apocrypha. For, tho' they were (as we do not deny) doubted of, by some of the Ancient Fathers, and not accepted for Canonical; Yet in the End (to use Mr. Rogers's Words) they were wholly Taken and Received by the common Consent of the Church of Christ, in this World, for the Word of God. † Vid. Third Council of Carthage; which decrees, That nothing should be Read in the Church, under the Name of Divine Scriptures, besides Canonical Scriptures: And defining which are Canonical, reckons those which the Church of England reject as Apochryphal. To this Council St. Augustin Subscribed; who (h), with S. Innoc. (i) Gelasius (k), and other Ancient Writers, number the said Books in the Canon of the Scrip. And Protest. themselves, confess, they were received in the number of Canonical Scriptures.

Brentius (l), a Protestant, says, There are some of the Ancient Fathers, who receive these Apocryphal Books into the number of Canonical Scriptures; and also some Councils command them to be acknowledged as Canonical.

Dr. Covell (m) also affirms of all these Books; That, if Rufinus be not deceived, they were approved, as parts of the Old Testament, by the Apostles.

So that what Christ's Church receives as Canonical, we are not to doubt of: Dr. Falk (n) avouches, That the Church of Christ has Judgment to discern True Writing from Counterfeit; and the Word of God, from the Writings of Men; and this Judgment she has of the H. Ghost. And Jewel (o) says, The Ch. of God has the Spirit of Wisdom, to discern True Script. from False.

To conclude therefore, in the Words of the Council of Trent (p); If any Man shall not receive for Sacred and Canonical, these whole Books, with all their parts, as they are read in the Catholick Church, and as they are in the Vulgar Latin Edition; Let him be Accursed.

* In the 6 of the 39 Art.

† The three last are not Numbered in the Canon of the Scripture. (a) See St. Hierom Ep. ad Hel. q. 3. (b) S. Hilary. l. 10. de Trinit. & Hierom. l. 2 contra Pelagian. (c) Euseb. H. l. 3. c. 39. (d) Id. l. 3. c. 3. (e) Et c. 25. 25. Hierom divinis Illust. in P. Jac. Fu. Pet. & Ep. ad Dardan.

(f) Survey of Chr. Suj. p. 664. Vid. l. 1. c. 4. day Confer. in the Town. Anno 1581. (g) Def. of the 39 Art. p. 31 Art. 6. † 3 Coun. Carthag. Can. 47. (h) De Doctr. Chri. l. 2. c. 8 (i) Ep. ad Exuper. c. 7. (k) Is. 1. Con. Decret. cum 70 Episc. p. (l) Brentius Apol. Conj. Writ. Sacra Scripta. Ang. p. 713. in Cov. con. Burg. p. 76; 77, & 78. in Bulk An. to a Count. Cath. p. 5 (m) Jewel def. of the Apol. p. 101 (n) Council. Trid. Sess. 4 De. ret. de Can. Scrip.

(o) Jewel def. of the Apol. p. 101 (p) Council. Trid. Sess. 4 De. ret. de Can. Scrip.

(q) Jewel def. of the Apol. p. 101 (r) Council. Trid. Sess. 4 De. ret. de Can. Scrip.

(s) Jewel def. of the Apol. p. 101 (t) Council. Trid. Sess. 4 De. ret. de Can. Scrip.

(u) Jewel def. of the Apol. p. 101 (v) Council. Trid. Sess. 4 De. ret. de Can. Scrip.

(w) Jewel def. of the Apol. p. 101 (x) Council. Trid. Sess. 4 De. ret. de Can. Scrip.

(y) Jewel def. of the Apol. p. 101 (z) Council. Trid. Sess. 4 De. ret. de Can. Scrip.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. Matth. cap. 16. ver. 18.	(a) <i>Et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, & super hanc Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam</i> meam [μὲν ἡ ἐκκλησίαν]	And I say to Thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I Build my Church.	(a) Instead of Church, they Tran- slate Congregati- on. — Upon this Rock will I build my Congregation.	It is Corrected in this last Translation.
St. Matth. cap. 18. ver. 17.	<i>Quod si non audie- rit eos, dic Ecclesiæ</i> [ἐκκλησίᾳ] <i>si autem Ecclesiam</i> [ἐκκλησίαν] <i>non audierit, sit tibi sicut Ethnicus & Pub- licanus.</i>	And if he will not hear them, tell the Church; and if he will not hear the Church, let him be as an Hea- then, and as a Pub- lican.	If he will not hear them, tell the Congregation; and if he will not hear the Congregation, &c.	Corrected.
Ephesians, cap. 5. ver. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32.	<i>Viri diligite ux- ores vestras sicut & Christus dilexit Ec- clesiam.</i> <i>Ut ex hiberet ipse sibi Gloriosam Ecce- siam.</i> <i>Sacramentum hoc est magnum; Ego au- tem dico in Christo & Ecclesia</i> [ἐκκλησίαν.]	Husbands Love your Wives, as Christ loved the Church, (v. 25.) That he might present to himself a Glorious Church, (v. 27.) For this is a great Sacrament; but I speak in Christ, and in the Church, v. 32, &c.	Husbands love your Wives, as Christ loved the Congregation. That he might present to himself a glorious Congre- gation. For this is a great Secret, for I speak in Christ, and in the Congre- gation.	Corrected. Corrected. Corrected.
Hebrews, cap. 2. ver. 23.	<i>Et Ecclesiam pri- mitivorum</i> [ἐκκλησία.]	And the Church of the First-Born.	And the Congre- gation of the First- Born.	Corrected.
Canticles, cap. 6. v. 8.	(b) <i>Una est Co- lumba mea.</i> [ἡ μία.]	My Dove is One.	(b) My Dove is alone.	My Dove is but One.
Ephesians, cap. 1. ver. 22, 23.	(c) <i>Et ipsum de- dit Caput supra omnem Ecclesiam, quæ est Corpus ipsius, & ple- nitude ejus, qui omnia in omnibus adimpletur</i> [ὅτι πληρούμενος.]	And hath made him Head over all the Church, which is his Body, the fulness of him which is filled all in all.	(c) And gave him to be the Head over all things to the Congregation, which is his Body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all	And gave Him to be the Head over all Things to the Church, which is his Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

THe Two English Bibles, accustomed to be read in the Protestant Congregations, at their first rising-up, left out the Word *Catholic*, in the Title of all those Epistles, which have been known by the Name of *Catholic Epistles*, ever since the Apostles Time*. And their latter Translations (dealing somewhat more Honestly) have turned the Word *Catholic* into *General*, saying, *The General Epistle of James, of Peter, &c.* As if we should say in our Creed, *We believe the General Church*. So that, by this Rule, when St. *Augustin* says, That the manner was in Cities, where there was Liberty of Religion, to ask, *Qua itur ad Catholicam?* We must Translate it, *Which is the way to the General?* And when St. *Hierom* says, If we agree in Faith with the Bishop of Rome, *Ergo Catholicus sumus*: we must Translate, *Then we are Generals*: Is not this good Stuff?

Bib. 1562.
1577.
* Eusebius
Hist. Eccl.
lib. 2. c. 23.
fine.

(a) And as they Suppress the Name *Catholic*; even so did they, in their first English Bible, the Name of *Church* it self: Because at their first Revolt and Apostacy from that *Church*, which was universally known to be the only true *Catholic Church*, it was a great Objection against their Schismatical Proceedings, and stuck much in the Peoples Consciences, that they left and forsook the *Church*, and that the *Church* condemn'd them: To obviate which, in the English Translation of 1562. they so totally Suppressed the Word *Church*, that 'tis not once to be found in all that Bible, so long read in their Congregations; because, knowing Themselves not to be the *Church*, they were resolv'd not to leave God Almighty any *Church* at all, where they could possibly root it out, [viz. in their Bible.] And 'tis probable, if it had been as easie for them to have Eradicated the *Church* out of the Earth, as it was to blot the Word out of their Bible, they would have prevented its Continuing to the End of the World.

Bible Printed Anno.
1562.

Another cause of their Suppressing the Name *Church*, was, That it should never sound in the common Peoples Ears, out of Scriptures; and that it might seem to the Ignorant, a good Argument against the Authority of the *Church*, to say, *We find not this Word Church in all the Bible*: As in other Articles, where they find not the Express Words in the Scripture.

Our Blessed Saviour says, *Upon this Rock will I build my Church*; But they make him say, *Upon this Rock I will build my Congregation*. They make the Apostle St. Paul say to Timothy (1 Ep. c. 3.) *The House of God, which is the Congregation* [not the *Church*] of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of Truth. Thus they thrust out God's Glorious, Unspotted, and most Beautiful Spouse, the *Church*; and, in place of it, Intrude their own Little, Wrinkled, and Spotted Congregation. So, they boldly make the Apostle say, *He hath made him Head of the Congregation, which is his Body*: And, in another place, *The Congregation of the First Born*; where the Apostle mentions *Heavenly Jerusalem*, the City of the Living God, &c. So that, by this Translation, there is no longer any *Church Militant* and *Triumphant*, but only *Congregation*; in which they contradict St. *Augustin*, who affirms, *That tho' the Jews Congregation was sometimes called a Church, yet the Apostles never called the Church a Congregation*. But their last Translation having restored the Word *Church*, I shall say no more of it in this place.

(b) Again, The True *Church* is known by Unity, which Mark is given Her by Christ himself; in whose Person Solomon speaking, says, *Una est Columba mea*; that is, *One is my Dove*, or, *My Dove is One*: Instead of this, They (being Themselves full of Sects and Divisions) will have it, *My Dove is Alone*: tho' neither the Hebrew nor Greek Word hath that signification; but, on the contrary, as properly signifies *One*, as *Unus* doth in Latin. But this is also amended in their last Translation.

(c) Nor was it enough for them to corrupt the Scripture, against the Churches Unity; for there was a Time, when their Congregation was Invisible; that is to say, when They were not at all: And therefore, because they will have it, That Christ may be without his *Church*, to wit, a Head without a Body; they falsifie this place in the Epistle to the Eph. c. 1. v. 22, 23. Translating, *He gave him to be the Head over all things to the Church, [Congregation with them] which (Church) is his Body, the Fulness of him that filleth all in all*. Here they translate Actively the Greek Word, ὅς τανταυα; when, according to St. *Chrysostome*, and all the Greek and Latin Doctors Interpretation, it ought to be translated Passively; so that, instead of saying, *And filleth all in all*; they should say, *The fulness of him which is filled all in all*; all faithful Men, as Members, and the whole *Church* as the Body, concurring to the fulness of Christ the Head. But thus they will not Translate, because, says Beza, *Christ needs no such Complement*: And if he need it not, then may he be without a *Church*; and consequently, 'tis no Absurdity, if the *Church* has been for many Years not only Invisible, but also not at all. Would a Man easily imagine, that such secret Poyson could lurk in their Translations? Thus they deal with the *Church*; let's now see, how they use particular points of Doctrine:

Protestants will have Christ to be an Head without a Body, during all that Time that their Congregation was invisible, viz. about 1500 Years.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. Matth. Cap. 26. Ver. 26.	(a) <i>Accepit Jesus panem & Benedixit, [καὶ εὐλογήσας] ac fre- git deditque, &c.</i>	Jesus took Bread and <i>Blessed</i> , and brake, and gave to His Disciples.	(a) Instead of <i>Blessed</i> , they Tran- slate, And when he had given Thanks.	Corrected.
St. Mark, Cap. 14. Ver. 22.	(a) <i>Accepit Jesus panem & Benedicens, [καὶ εὐλογήσας,] &c.</i>	Jesus took Bread, and <i>Blessing</i> , &c.	(a) Instead of <i>Blessing</i> , they say, and when he had given Thanks.	Corrected.
Acts Apof. cap. 3. ver. 21.	(b) <i>Quem oportet quidem Cælum susci- pere usque in tempora restitutionis omnium, [ὅτι δεῖ ἑξέσθαι Νέαν αἰῶνα.]</i>	Whom Heaven truly must <i>Receive</i> , until the Times of the restitution of all Things.	(b) Instead of <i>Receive</i> , they say, Whom Heav- en must Contain. And Bezä, Who must be contained in Heaven.	Corrected.
Jeremiah, cap. 11. ver. 19.	(c) <i>Mittamus lig- num in Panem ejus.</i>	Let us cast Wood upon his <i>Bread</i> .	We will destroy his Meat with Wood. In another Bible, Let us de- stroy the Tree with the Fruit.	Let us destroy the Tree with the <i>Fruit</i> thereof.
Genesis, cap. 14. ver. 18.	(d) <i>At vero Mel- chizedek Rex Salem proferens Panem & vinum, erat enim Sa- cerdos Dei Altissimi.</i>	And Melchizedek, King of <i>SALEM</i> , brought forth Bread and Wine; <i>For</i> he was the Priest of God most high.	(d) Instead of <i>For He was the Priest</i> ; they Tran- slate, And he was the Priest, &c.	Instead of <i>For</i> , they Translate <i>And</i> .

(a) THE turning of *Blessing* into bare *Thanksgiving*, was one of the first steps of our pretended *Reformers*, towards the denying the *Real Presence*. By endeavouring to take away the Operation and Efficacy of *CHRIST's Blessing*, pronounced upon the *Bread and Wine*, They would make it no more than a *Thanksgiving* to *GOD*: And that, not only in Translating *Thanksgiving* for *Blessing*, but also in urging the Word *Eucharist*, to prove it a meer *Thanksgiving*; tho' we find the Verb *ευχαριστειν* us'd also Translively by the Greek Fathers, saying, *† αρεν ευχαριστια. Panem & Chalicem Eucharistifatos*; or, *Panem, in quo gratia alie sunt*; that is, *The Bread and Cup made the Eucharist: The Bread, over which Thanks are given*; that is, *Which, by the Word of Prayer and Thanksgiving, is made a Consecrated Meat, the Flesh and Blood of CHRIST*. St. Paul alio, speaking of this Sacrament, calls it, (*1 Cor. 10.*) *The Chalice of Benediction, which we do Bless*; which St. Cyprian thus explicates, *The Chalice Consecrated by Solemn Blessing*. St. Basil, and St. Chrysostome, in their Liturgies, say thus, *Bless, O Lord, the Sacred Bread*; and, *Bless, O Lord, the Sacred Cup, changing it by thy Holy Spirit*: where is signified the Consecration and Transmutation thereof, into the *Body and Blood of CHRIST*.

(b) And by this corrupt Translation, they would have *CHRIST* so Included in *Heaven*, that He cannot be with us upon the Altar. Beza confesses, *That he Translates it thus, on purpose to keep Christ's Presence from the Altar*; which is so far from the Greek, that not only *Ilyricus*, but even *Calvin* himself, dislikes it. And you may easily judge, how contrary to St. Chrysostome it is, who tells us, *That Christ Ascending into Heaven, both left us His Flesh, and yet Ascending bath the same*. And again, *O Miracle! says he, He that sits above with the Father, in the same Moment of Time is handled with the Hands of All*. This, you see, is the Faith and Doctrine of the Ancient Fathers; and it is the Faith of the *Catholic Church*, at this day. Who sees not, That this Faith is far greater, thus to believe the Presence of *CHRIST* in both Places at once, because He is Omnipotent; than the *Protestant Faith*, which believes no further than that He is *Ascended*; and that therefore He cannot be Present upon the Altar, nor dispose of his *Body* as He pleases? If We should ask them, whether He was also in *Heaven*, when He appeared to *Saul* going to *Damascus*; or, whether He can be both in *Heaven*, and with his *Church* on *Earth*, to the end of the World, as He promis'd; perhaps, by this Doctrine of Theirs, They would be put to a stand?

Consider further, how plain our Saviour's Words [*This is my Body*] are for the *Real Presence* of His *BODY*: And for the *Real Presence* of His *BLOOD* in the *Chalice*, what can be more plainly spoken, than, — *This is the Chalice, the New Testament in my Blood, which [Chalice] is shed for you*: According to the Greek, [*το πομιον το ενχλυονον*] the Word [*Which*] must needs be referred to the *Chalice*: In which Speech, *Chalice* cannot otherwise be taken, than for *That* in the *Chalice*; which, sure, must needs be the *Blood of Christ*, and not *Wine*, because His *Blood* only was shed for us; According to St. Chrysostome, who says, *That which is in the Chalice, is the same which gushed out of his Side*: And this deduction so troubled Beza, that he exclaims against all the Greek Copies in the World, as Corrupted in this place.

(c) Let us cast Wood upon his Bread; that is, saith St. Hierom†, *The Cross upon the Body of our Saviour*; for it is He that said, *I am the Bread that descended from Heaven*: Where the Prophet so long before, saying, *Bread*, and meaning his *Body*, alludes Prophetically to his *Body* in the *Blessed Sacrament*, made of *Bread*, and under the form of *Bread*; and therefore, also called *Bread* by the Apostle (*1 Cor. 10.*): So that both in the Prophet, and the Apostle, his *Bread* and his *Body* is all one. And lest We should think the *Bread* only signifies his *Body*, he says, *Let us put the Cross upon his Bread*; that is, upon his very Natural *Body* that hung on the Cross. 'Tis evident, that the *Hebrew* Verb is not now the same with *That*, which the *Seventy Interpreters* Translated into *Greek*, and St. Jerom into *Latin*; but altered, as may be supposed, by the *Jews*, to obscure this Prophecy of their Crucifying *CHRIST* upon the Cross: And tho' *Protestants* will needs take the advantage of this Corruption; yet so little does the *Hebrew* Word, that now is, agree with the Words following, that they cannot so Translate it, as to make any commodious Sense or Understanding of it; as appears by their different Translations, and their Transposing their Words in *English*, otherwise than they are in the *Hebrew*.

(d) If *Protestants* should grant *Melchizedek's* Typical Sacrifice of *Bread and Wine*, then would follow also, a Sacrifice of the *New Testament*; which, to avoid, They purposely Translate [*And*] in this place; when, in other *places, the same *Hebrew* Particle [*Van*] They Translate *Enim*, *For*; not being Ignorant, that it is in those, as in this place, better exprest by *For* or *Because*, than by *And*. See the Exposition of the † Fathers upon it.

St. Justin
in fine 2.
Apolog.
St. Irenaeus
lib. 4. 34.

Hier. 2. ad
P. pul. An-
tirochen.
lib. 3. de
Sacerdotia.

Luke 22
ver. 20.

St. Chryso-
stome in 1
Cor. cap.
10. Hom.
24.
† St. Hier.
in Com. in
cap. 11. ver.
19. Hierom.
Prophecia.

* Gen. 20.
ver. 3.
Gen. 30.
ver. 27.
Isaiah, 64.
ver. 5.
† St. Cyprian
Ep. 63.
Epiph. kar.
59, & 79.
St. Hierom
in Math.
26. & in
Epist. ad
Euzarium.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Proverbs, cap. 9. ver. 5.	(a) <i>Venite comedite Panem meum, & Bibite Vinum quod Miscui vobis</i> [מִשְׁכֵּי] <i>miscui</i> .	Come Eat my Bread, and Drink the Wine which I have Mingled for you.	(a) The Corruption is, Drink the Wine which I have Drawn ; instead of Mingled .	Come Eat of my Bread, and Drink of the Wine which I have mingled.
Proverbs, cap. 9. ver. 1.	(a) <i>Immolavit victimas suas Miscuit Vinum</i> [מִשְׁכֵּי].	She hath Immolated Her Hosts, She hath Mingled Her Wine.	(a) She hath Drawn her Wine.	She hath Killed her Beasts; she hath mingled her Wine.
1 Corinth. cap. 11. ver. 27.	<i>Itaque quicumque manducaverit Panem hunc, Vel [h] Biberit Calicem Domini indigne, &c.</i>	Therefore, whosoever shall Eat this Bread, Or Drink the Chalice of our Lord unworthily, &c.	-----	Wherefore, whosoever shall Eat this Bread, And Drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, &c.
1 Corinth. cap. 9. ver. 13.	(b) <i>Et qui Altari deseruiunt, cum Altari participant</i> [δυναστεύειν].	And they that serve the Altar, participate with the Altar.	(b) Instead of Altar, they Translate Temple .	Corrected.
1 Corinth. cap. 10. ver. 18.	(b) <i>Nonne qui edunt Hostias participes sunt Altaris</i> [δυναστεύειν].	They that Eat the Hosts, are they not Partakers of the Altar?	(b) Partakers of the Temple?	Corrected.
Daniel, cap. 14. ver. 12.	(c) <i>Quia fecerant sub Mensa absconditum introitum</i> [εἰσόδον].	For they had made a Privy Entrance under the Table.	(c) For, under the Table, they say, under the Altar .	The Two last Chapters they call <i>Apocrypha</i> .
Et ver. 17.	<i>Intuitus Rex Mensam.</i>	The King beholding the Table:	The King beholding the Altar.	
Et etiam Verf. 20.	<i>Et consumeabant quæ erant super Mensam.</i>	And they did consume the things which was upon the Table.	Which was upon the Altar.	

(a) **T**Hese Prophetical Words of Solomon's are of great Importance, as being a manifest Prophecy of **CHRIST**'s mingling Water and Wine in the Chalice at His last Supper; which, at this Day, the *Catholick Church* observes: But *Protestants*, counting it an Idle Ceremony, frame their Translation accordingly; suppressing altogether this *Mixture* or *Mingling*, contrary to the true Interpretation both of the *Greek* and *Hebrew*; as also, contrary to the Ancient Fathers Exposition of this Place. *The Holy Ghost*, (saith St. Cyprian) by Solomon, fore-sheweth a Type of our Lord's Sacrifice, of the Immolated Host of Bread and Wine; saying, *Wisdom hath killed her Hosts, She hath mingled her Wine into the Cup. Come ye, Eat my Bread, and Drink the Wine that I have mingled for you.* Speaking of **WINE MINGLED**, (saith this Holy Doctor) He fore-sheweth Prophetically, the Cup of our Lord **MINGLED WITH WATER AND WINE**. St. Justin, from the same Greek Word, calls it, *κρῆμα*; that is, (according to Plutarch) *Wine mingled with Water*: So likewise does St. Irenaeus: See also the Sixth General Council, † treating largely hereof, and deducing it from the Apostles, and Ancient Fathers; and Interpreting this Greek Word by another Equivalent, and more plainly signifying this mixture, viz. *ἡγυῖον*.

In this place, they very falsely Translate *And*, instead of *Or*, contrary both to the *Greek* and *Latin*. And this they do, on purpose to Infer a necessity of Communicating under Both kinds, as the Conjunctive [*And*] may seem to do: Whereas, by the Disjunctive [*Or*] 'tis evident, That we may Communicate in One kind only; as was, in divers cases, the Practice of the *Primitive Church*; as also of the Apostles Themselves, (*Act. 2. 42. and 20. 7.*)

But the practice of our Saviour is the best Witness of his Doctrine; who, sitting at the Table at *Emaus**, with two of his Disciples, Took Bread, and Blessed, and Brake it, and did reach to them. By which St. Augustin, and † other Fathers, understand the *Eucharist*: Where no mention's made of Wine, or the Chalice; but the reaching of the Bread, their knowing Him, and his Vanishing away so joyed, that not any Time is left for the Benediction and Consecration of the Chalice.

In the *Primitive Times*, It was the custom to administer the Blood only to Children, as St. Cyprian tells us: And, both He and Tertul. say, That it was their Practice, most commonly, to reserve the Body of Christ: Which, as Eusebius witnesses, They were wont to give alone to Sick People, for their Viaticum: Also, The Holy Hermits in the Wilderness, commonly receiv'd and reserv'd the Blessed Body alone, and not the Blood, as St. Basil tells us.

For Whole Christ is Really Present, under either kind, as *Protestants* themselves have confess'd; read their Words in *Hospinian** a *Protestant*, who affirms, That They believed and confessed Whole Christ to be really Present, Exhibited and Received under Either Kind; and therefore under the only Form of Bread: Neither did they Judge those to do Evil, who Communicated under One Kind.— And Luther, as alledg'd by *Hospinian* † says, That it is not needful to give Both Kinds, but the One alone sufficeth; the Church has Power of Ordaining only One, and the People ought to be content therewith, if it be Ordained by the Church. Whence is granted, That 'tis Lawful for the Church of God, upon just occasions, absolutely to determine or limit the use thereof.

(b) To Translate *Temple* instead of *Altar*, is so gross a Corruption, that had it not been done thrice immediately within two Chapters, one would have thought it had been done of over-sight, and not of purpose. The Name of *Altar* both in *Hebrew* and *Greek*, and by the custom of all People, both *Jews* and *Pagans*, implies and imports a Sacrifice. We therefore, in respect of the Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, say *Altar*, rather than *Table*, as all the Ancient Fathers were accustomed to Speak and Write; tho', in respect of Eating and Drinking Christ's Body and Blood, it is also called a *Table*. But because *Protestants* will have only a Communion of Bread and Wine, or a Supper, and no Sacrifice; therefore, They call it *Table* only, and abhor the Word *Altar*, as Papistical; especially in their first Translation of 1562. which was made when they were digging down *Altars* throughout *England*.

(c) Where the Name *Altar* should be, they Suppress it; and Here, where it should not be, they put it in their Translations; and that Thrice in one Chapter; and that either on purpose to dishonour *Catholick Altars*, or else to save the credit of their *Communion-Table*; as fearing, lest the Name of *Bell's Table* might redound to the dishonour of their *Communion-Table*. Wherein 'tis to be wondred, how they could imagine it any disgrace, either for *Table* or *Altar*, if the *Idols* also had their *Tables* and *Altars*, whereas St. Paul so plainly Names both together: *The Table of our Lord, and the Table of Devils*. If the *Table of Devils*, why not the *Table of Bell*? By this we see, how light a thing it was with them to Corrupt the Scripture in those days.

Ep. 63. 2.

Apol. 2. in fine.
St. Irenaeus lib. 5. prop. Init.
† Council. Constantinopol. 6.
Can. 32.

* Luke 24. ver. 30.
Lib. 3. de Consensu.
† Hier. Epistolae Paulae Bedae.
Theophylact.
St. Cyprian.
1. de lapsis n. 10.
Tertul. 1. 2. ad Ux. m. 3.
Eu'eb. Eccl. Hist. 1. 6. c. 36.
St. Basil Ep. 28 ad Cassianum Patrum.

* Hospin. Hist. Sacram. Part. 2. Fol. 112.
† 15. Tab. 12.

1 Cor. 10. 1. cor. 21.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
Acts Apof. cap. 15. ver. 2.	<i>Statuerunt ut Af- cenderent Paulus & Barnabas & quidam alii ex aliis ad Apo- stolos & Presbyteros [πρεσβυτερος] in Jeru- salem, &c.</i>	They appointed that Paul and Bar- nabas should go up, and certain others of the rest, to the Apo- stles and <i>Priests</i> un- to Jerusalem.	Instead of <i>Priests</i> , they Translate <i>El- ders</i> .	For <i>Priests</i> , they say here also <i>Elders</i> .
Titus, cap. 1. ver. 5.	<i>Hujus rei gratia reliqui te Creta, ut ea quæ defunt corrigas, & constituas per Ci- uitates Presbyteros sicut & ego disposui tibi.</i>	For this cause left I thee in Creet, that thou should'st Re- form the things that are wanting, and should'st Ordain <i>Priests</i> by Cities, as I also appointed thee.	Instead of <i>Priests</i> , they Translate <i>El- ders</i> .	For <i>Priests</i> they say <i>Elders</i> .
1 Timoth. cap. 5. ver. 17.	<i>Qui bene Præsunt Presbyteri duplici honore digni habeantur.</i>	The <i>Priests</i> that Rule well, let them be esteemed worthy of double Honour.	The <i>Elders</i> that Rule well, &c.	<i>Elders</i> also in this Bible.
1 Timoth. cap. 5. ver. 19.	<i>Adversus Presby- terum accusationem noli recipere, &c.</i>	Against a <i>Priest</i> receive not Accusa- tion, &c.	Against an El- der receive not ac- cusation, &c.	Instead of <i>Priest</i> they put <i>Elder</i> .
St. James, cap. 5. ver. 14.	<i>Infirmatur quis in vobis inducat Presby- teros Ecclesiæ & o- rent super eum.</i>	Is any Man Sick among you, let him bring in the <i>Priests</i> of the Church, and let them Pray over him.	----- Let him bring in the <i>Elders</i> of the Congregati- on, &c.	<i>Elders</i> for <i>Priests</i> here also.

ST. AUGUSTIN affirms, That in the Divine Scripture several Sacrifices are mentioned, Some Before the Manifestation of the New Testament, &c. and Another Now, which is agreeable to this Manifestation, &c. and which is demonstrated not only from the Evangelical, but also from the Prophetic, Writings: A Truth most certain; our Sacrifice of the New Testament being clearly proved from the Sacrifice of Melchizedek in the Old Testament; of whom, and whose Sacrifice, 'tis said, But Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth Bread and Wine; for he was the Priest of God most high, and he blessed him, &c. And to make the Figure agree to the Thing figured, and the Truth to answer the Figure of Christ; 'tis said, Our Lord has Sworn, and it shall not repent him; Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the Order of Melchizedek. In the New Testament, Jesus is made an High Priest, according to the Order of Melchizedek. For, according to the Similitude of Melchizedek, there arises another Priest, — who Continues for ever, and has an everlasting Priesthood Whence is clearly proved, That Melchizedek was a Priest, and Offered in Sacrifice, Bread and Wine; therein prefiguring Christ our Saviour, and his Sacrifice daily Offered in the Church, under the Forms of Bread and Wine, by an everlasting Priesthood.

St. August.
Ep. 49. q. 3.

Plal. 110.
ver. 4.
Hebr. 6.
ver. 20. &
cap. 7. ver.
15, 17, 24.

But the English Protestants, on purpose to Abolish the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, did not only take away the Word Altar, out of the Scripture; but they also Suppress'd the Name Priest in all their Translations, turning it into Elder (a); well knowing, that these Three, Priest, Sacrifice, and Altar, are Dependents and Consequents one of another; so that they cannot be separated. If there be an External Sacrifice, there must be an External Priesthood to Offer it; and an Altar to Offer the same upon. So CHRIST himself being a Priest, according to the Order of Melchizedek, had a Sacrifice, His Body; and an Altar, His Cross, on which He Offer'd it. And because He Instituted this Sacrifice, to continue in His Church for ever, in Commemoration and Representation of His Death; therefore did He ordain His Apostles Priests, at His Last Supper; where, and when He Instituted the Holy Order of Priesthood or Priests (saying, HOC FACITE, Do this) to Offer the self-same Sacrifice in a Mystical and Unbloody manner, until the World's End.

But our New Pretended Reformers have made the Scriptures quite Dumb, as to the Name of any such Priest or Priesthood, as We now speak of; never so much as once naming Priest, unless when mention is made either of the Priests of the Jews, or of the Priests of the Gentiles; especially when such are reprehended, and blam'd in the Holy Scripture; and in such places they are sure to name Priests in their Translations, on purpose to make the very Name of Priest Odious among the common Ignorant People. — Again, They have also the Name, Priests, when they are taken for all manner of Men, Women, or Children, that Offer Internal and Spiritual Sacrifices; whereby they would falsely signify, That there are no other Priests in the Law of Grace. As Whitaker, one of their great Champions, freely avouches, directly contrary to St. Augustin; who, in one brief Sentence, distinguishes Priests, properly so call'd in the Church; and Priests, as it is a common Name to all Christians. This Name then of Priest and Priesthood, properly so called, (as St. Augustin says) They wholly Suppress; never Translating the Word Presbyteros, Priests, but Elders; and that with so full and general consent, in All Their English Bibles, that (as the Puritans plainly confess, and Mr. Whitgift denies it not) a Man would wonder to see, how careful They are, that the People may not once hear of the Name of any such Priest in all the Holy Scriptures: And even in their Latter Translations, tho' They are ashamed of the Word Eldership; yet they have not the Power to put the English Word Priesthood, as they ought to do, in the Text, that the Vulgar might understand it; but rather the Greek Word Presbytery: Such poor shifts They are glad to make use of.

Whitaker,
pag. 199.
St. August.
lib. 20. de
Civitat. Dei,
cap. 10.
See the
Puritans
Reply, pag.
159. And
Whitgifts
Defence a-
gainst the
Puritans,
pag. 712.

So blinded were these Novellists with Heresie, that They could not see, how the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers, and Ecclesiastical Custom, have drawn several Words from their Prophane and Common Signification, to a more Peculiar and Ecclesiastical One; as Episcopus, which in Tully is an Overseer, is a Bishop in the New Testament; so the Greek Word χειρουργία, signifying Ordain, They Translate as Prophanely, as if They were in hand with Demosthenes, or the Laws of Athens, rather than the Holy Scriptures; when as St. Hierom tells them, That it signifieth, Clericorum Ordinationem; that is, Giving of Holy Orders, which is done not only by Prayer of the Voice, but by Imposition of the Hands, according to St. Paul unto Timothy, Impose hands suddenly on no Man; that is, Be not hasty to give Holy Orders. In like manner, they Translate Minister for Deacon, Embassador for Apostle, Messenger for Angel, &c. leaving, I say, the Ecclesiastical use of the Word, for the Original signification.

St. Hierom
in cap. 58.
Ejaj.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Acts Apof. cap. 14. ver. 22.	(a) <i>Et cum Con- stituisent [χρηστὴν- οὐκ] illis per singu- las Ecclesias Presby- teros [πρεσβυτέρους.]</i>	And when they had Ordained to them <i>Priests</i> in eve- ry Church.	And when they had ordained El- ders by Election in every Congregati- on.	<i>Elders</i> set instead of <i>Priests</i> .
1 Timoth. cap. 4. ver. 14.	(b) <i>Noli negligere Gratiam [χάρισμα] quæ in te est quæ data est tibi per Propheti- am cum Impositione manuum Presbyterii.</i>	Neglect not the <i>Grace</i> that is in thee, which is given thee by Prophecy, with Imposition of the hands of <i>Priesthood</i> .	(b) Instead of <i>Grace</i> , they Tran- slate <i>Gift</i> ; And <i>Eldership</i> , instead of <i>Priesthood</i> .	For the Word <i>Grace</i> , they say <i>Gift</i> ; And <i>Presbytery</i> , the Greek Word, rather than the English Word; <i>Priesthood</i> .
2 Timoth. cap. 1. ver. 6.	<i>Propter quam cau- sam admonco te ut resuscites Gratiam Dei quæ est in te per Impositionem manuum mearum.</i>	For the which cause I admonish thee, that thou re- suscitate the <i>Grace</i> of God, which is in thee, by the Imposi- tion of my Hands.	Instead of the Word <i>Grace</i> , They say <i>Gift</i> .	They Translate <i>Gift</i> , instead of <i>Grace</i> .
1 Timoth. cap. 3. ver. 8.	(c) <i>Diaconos fi- militer Pudicos non bilingues, &c. [Διακόνους.]</i>	<i>Deacons</i> in like- manner <i>Chast</i> , not double-tongued, &c.	(c) <i>Ministers</i> for <i>Deacons</i> .	Likewise must the <i>Deacons</i> be <i>Grave</i> .
Et ver. 12.	(d) <i>Διακόνι, Diaconi.</i>	<i>Deacons</i> .	<i>Deacons</i> .	<i>Deacons</i> .

(a) WE have heard, in Old Time, of making *Priests*; and, of Late days, of making *Ministers*; but who-ever heard (in *England*) of making *Elders* by *Election*? yet, in their First Translations, it continued a Phrase of *Scripture*, till King *James* the First's Time; and then They thought good to blot out the Words [*by Election*,] beginning to consider, that such *Elders* as were made only by *Election*, without *Consecration*, could not pretend to much more Power of Administring the *Sacraments*, than a *Church-Warden*, or *Constable* of the *Parish*; for, if they deny'd *Ordination* to be a *Sacrament* †; and consequently, to give *Grace*, and Impress a Character, doubtless they could not attribute much to a bare *Election*: And yet, in those Days, when this Translation was made, Their Doctrine was, *That in the New Testament, Election, without Consecration, was sufficient to make a Priest or Bishop*: Witness *Cranmer* himself, who being ask'd, Whether in the *New Testament*, there is required any Consecration of a *Bishop* or *Priest*? Answered thus, under his Hand, viz. *In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a Priest or Bishop, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture; for Election thereunto is sufficient.* And Dr. *Stillingfleet* informs us, That *Cranmer* has declared, *That a Governour could make Priests, as well as Bishops.* And Mr. *Whitaker* tells us, *That there are no Priests now in the Church of Christ*, (Pag. 200. *advers. Camp.*) that is, (as he interprets himself, Pag. 210.) *This Name Priest is never in the New Testament peculiarly applied to the Ministers of the Gospel.* And we are not Ignorant, how both King *Edward* the Sixth, and Queen *Elizabeth*, made *Bishops* by their Letters Patents only, (let our *Lambeth-Records* pretend what they will): To Authorize which, 'tis no wonder, if they made the *Scripture* say, *When they had ordained Elders by Election, instead of Priests by Imposition of Hands*; tho' contrary to the Fourth Council of *Carthage*, which enjoyns, *That when a Priest takes his Orders, the Bishop Blessing him, and holding his Hand upon his Head, all the Priests also that are Present, hold their Hands by the Bishop's Hand, upon his Head*: So are our *Priests* made at This Day; And so would Now the Clergy of the *Church of England* pretend to be made, if They had but *Bishops* and *Priests* able to make them. For which purpose, They have not only Corrected this Error, in Their Last Translations; but have also gotten the Words, *Bishop* and *Priest*, thrust into Their Forms of Ordination: But the Man that wants Hands to work with, is not much better for having Tools.

Moreover, Some of our Pretenders to *Priesthood*, would gladly have *Holy Order* to take its place again among the *Sacraments*: And therefore, both Dr. *Bramhall*, and Mr. *Adams*, reckon it for a *Sacrament*, tho' quite contrary to their *Scripture Translators*; who, lest it should be so accounted, do Translate (b) *Gift* instead of *Grace*; lest it should appear, that *Grace* is given in *Holy Orders*. I wonder, They have not Corrected This in Their latter Translations; but, perhaps, They durst not do it, for fear of making it Clash with the 25th. of Their 39. Articles. 'Tis no less to be admired, that since They began to be Enamour'd of *Priesthood*, They have not displac'd that Prophane Intruder, *Elder*, and placed the true Ecclesiastical Word, *Priest*, in the Text. But to this I hear Them object, That our *Latin* Translation hath *Seniores & Majores* &c. & therefore, why may not They also Translate *Elder*? To which I Answer, *That this is nothing to Them, who profess to Translate the Greek, and not Our Latin*; and the *Greek* Word They know is *πρεσβυτερος*, *Presbyteros*. Again, I say, That if They meant no worse than the Old *Latin* Translator did, They would be as indifferent as He, to have said sometimes *Priest* and *Priesthood*, when He has the Words *Presbyteros* and *Presbyterium*, as We are indifferent in Our Translation, saying, *Seniors* and *Ancients*, when We find it so in *Latin*: Being well assured, that by Sundry Words he meant but One Thing, as in *Greek* it is but One. St. *Hierom* reads, *Presbyteros ego comprehender* † (in 1. ad Gal.) proving the Dignity of *Priests*: And yet in the 4th. of the *Galatians*, he reads, according to the *Vulgar Latin Text*, *Seniores in vobis rogo Confensor & ipse*: whereby it is evident, that *Senior* here, and in the *Acts*, is a *Priest*; and not, on the contrary, *Presbyter*, an *Elder*.

(c) In this place they thrust the Word *Minister* into the Text, for an Ecclesiastical Order: So that, tho' they will not have *Bishops Priests* and *Deacons*, yet they would gladly have *Bishops Ministers* and *Deacons*: yet the Word they Translate for *Minister*, is *διακονος*, *Diaconus*; the very same that, a little after, (d) they Translate *Deacon*. And so because *Bishops* went before in the same Chapter, they have found out three Orders, *Bishops, Ministers* and *Deacons*. How poor a shift is this, that they are forc'd to make the Apostle speak Three things for Two, on purpose to get a place in the *Scripture* for their *Ministers*?—As likewise, in another place *, on purpose to make room for their *Ministers Wives*, (for there's no living without them) they Translate *Wife* instead of *Woman*, making St. *Paul* say, *Havz not we Power to eat about a Wife?* &c. for which cause they had rather say *Grave* than *Chast*.

† 25 of the 39 Articles.

See Dr. Burnet's Hist. See Stillingfleet. Irenicum. pag. 392.

Concil. 3. Anno 436. where St. Augustin was present and Subscribed.

Dr. Bram. pag. 96. Malon lib. 1.

† St. Hier. Ep. 89. ad Evagri.

* 1 Cor. xv. 5.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
Malachy, cap. 2. ver. 7.	(a) <i>Labia enim Sacerdotis custodient Scientiam & Legem requirunt ex ore ejus quia Angelus Domini Exercituum est.</i>	The Priests Lips shall keep Know- ledge, and they shall seek the Law at his Mouth; because he is the Angel of the Lord of Hosts.	(a) The Priests Lips should keep Knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his Mouth; because he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts.	For shall, they Translate should. And for Angel, Messenger in This also.
Apocalips, cap. 2, 3. ver. 1, 8, 12.	Angelo Ephesi Ec- clesiæ Scribe.	To the Angel of the Church of Ephe- sus, write thou.	To the Messen- ger of, &c. instead of Angel.	Corrected.
Malachy, cap. 3. ver. 1.	(b) <i>Ecce ego mit- to Angelum meum [τον ἀγγέλον μου] & præparabit viam an- te Faciem meam & Statim veniet ad Templum suum Domi- nator quem vos queri- tis & Angelus Testa- menti quem vos vultis.</i>	Behold, I send mine Angel, and he shall prepare the way before my Face. And the Ruler whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his Temple, even the Angel of the Testament, whom ye wish for.	Instead of Angel, they say Messenger. And for Angel of the Testament, they Tran- slate, Messenger of the Covenant.	The same also they Translate Here, without any Cor- rection.
Matthew, cap. 11. ver. 10.	<i>Hic est enim de qua Scriptum est, ecce ego mitto Angelum meum ante Faciem tuam.</i>	For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send mine Angel before thy Face.	For Angel, they say Messenger.	Instead of Angel, they say Messenger.
Luke, cap. 7. ver. 27.	<i>Hic est de quo Scriptum est ecce mit- to Angelum meum, &c.</i>	This is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send mine Angel, &c.	----- Behold I send my Messen- ger, &c.	For Angel, Mes- senger.
1 Corinth. cap. 2. ver. 10.	(d) <i>Si quid D. na- vi propter vos in Per- sona Christi [ἐν πρὸς σωτῆρι Χρ. ἑστί.]</i>	If I Pardoned any thing for you in the Person of Christ.	(d) ----- In the Sight of Christ.	Corrected.

25 of the
39 Article,
Rogers's
Defence of
the same,
pag. 155.

St. Hierom
in Coment.
in hunc lo-
cum.
St. Greg.
Hom 6 in
Evang.

1 Cor. 2,
ver. 10.

1 Cor. 5,
ver. 4.
* Part. 2.
A3. 3.

(a) Because our Pretended Reformers teach, *That Order is not a Sacrament; That it has neither Visible Sign, [What is Imposition of Hands?] nor Ceremony ordain'd of God; nor Form; nor Institution from Christ, (consequently, that it cannot Imprint a Character in the Soul of the Person Ordain'd);* They not only avoid the Name *Priest*, in their Translations; but, the more to derogate from the Privilege and Dignity of *Priests*, They make the *Scripture*, in this place, speak quite contrary to the words of the Prophet; as they are read both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, *οὐδὲ σταυρὸν ἐκζητήσουσιν, οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος*; where 'tis as plain as can be spoken, that, *The Priests Lips shall keep Knowledge, and they shall seek the Law at his Mouth*; which is a wonderful Privilege given to the *Priests* of the *Old Law*, for true determination in Matters of Controversie, and right Expounding of the *Law*, as we may read more fully in *Deuteronomy* the 17th. where they are commanded, under pain of Death, to stand to the *Priests* Judgment: Which in this place, (Ver. 4.) *GOD*, by his Prophet *Malasby*, calls, *His Covenant with Levi*, and that He will have it to stand, to wit, in the *New Testament*, where *St. Peter* has such Privilege for him, and his Successors, that his Faith shall not fail; and where the *Holy Ghost* is President in the Councils of *Bishops* and *Priests*. All which, the Reformers of our Days would Deface and Defeat, by Translating the Words otherwise than the *Holy Ghost* has spoken them. And when the Prophet adds immediately the Cause of this singular Prerogative of the *Priest*; *Because he is the Angel of the Lord of Hosts* (which is also a wonderful Dignity to be so called); They Translate, *Because he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts*. So do They also, in the *Revelations*, call the *Bishops* of the Seven Churches of *Asia*, Messengers.

(b) And here, in like manner, they call *St. John Baptist*, Messenger; where the *Scripture*, no doubt, speaks more Honourably of him, as being *CHRIST's* Precursor, than of a Messenger, which is a term for *Posts* and *Lacques*. The *Scripture*, I say, speaks more Honourably of him: And our Saviour, in the Gospel, telling the People the wonderful Dignities of *St. John*, and that he was more than a Prophet, cites this place, and gives this reason; *For this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send mine Angel before thee*: Which *St. Hierom* calls, *Meritorum αὐξήσις*, *The Increase and Augmenting of John's Merits or Privileges*. And *St. Gregory* says, He which came to bring tidings of *CHRIST* himself, was worthily call'd an *Angel*, that in his very Name there might be Dignity: And all the Fathers conceive a great Excellency of this Name *Angel*; only our Protestants, who measure all Divine Things and Persons by the Line of their Human Understanding, and translate accordingly; making our Saviour say, *That John was more than a Prophet*, because he was a Messenger. (c) Yea, where our Blessed Saviour himself is called, *Angelus Testamenti*, *The Angel of the Testament*; there they translate, *The Messenger of the Covenant*.

St. Hierom translated not *Nuncius*, but *Angelus*; and the Church, and all Antiquity, both Reading and Expounding it as a term of more Dignity and Excellency, Why do the Novelists of our Age, thus boldly disgrace the very Eloquence of Scripture, which, by such terms of Amplification, would speak more significantly and emphatically? Why, I say, do they for *Angel* translate *Messenger*? for *Apostle*, *Legate* or *Ambassador*, and the like? Doubtless, this is all done to take away, as much as possible, the Dignity and Excellency of *Priesthood*. Yet, methinks, they should have Corrected this in their Latter Translations, when They began Themselves to aspire to the Title of *Priests*; whose Name, however, they may Usurp, yet cannot They hitherto attain to the Authority and Power of *Priesthood*. They are but *Priests* in Name only, the Power They want; and therefore are pleased to be content with the ordinary Stile of *Messengers*; not yet daring to term Themselves *Angels*, as *St. John* did the *Bishops* of the Seven Churches of *Asia*.

(d) But, great is the Authority, Dignity, Excellency, and Power of *GOD's* *Priests* and *Bishops*: They do Bind and Loose, and Execute all Ecclesiastical Functions, as in the Person and Power of *CHRIST*, whose Ministers they are. So *St. Paul* says, *That when he Pardon'd or Relas'd the Penance of the Incestuous Corinthian, he did it in the Person of CHRIST*; (They falsly translate, *In the Sight of CHRIST*); that is, as *St. Ambrose* Expounds it, *In the Name of Christ, In His stead*, and as His Vicar and Deputy: And when he Excommunicated the said Incestuous Person, he said, *He did it in the Name, and with the Virtue of our Lord Jesus CHRIST*.—And the Fathers of the Council of *Ephesus* * avouch, *That no Man doubts, yea, 'tis known to all Ages, That Holy and most Blessed Peter, Prince and Head of the Apostles, Pillar of Faith, and Foundation of the Catholick Church, Receiv'd from our Lord Jesus CHRIST, the Keys of the Kingdom; and that Power of Loosing and Binding Sins was given him; who, in his Successors, lives and exercises Judgment to this very Time, and always.*

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562,1577,1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Matthew, cap. 2. ver. 6. Micah, cap. 5. ver. 2.	(e) <i>Ex te enim ex- iet Dux qui Regat Populum meum Israel.</i> לְיָשׁוּעַ מֶלֶךְ τὸ ἄνωγες εἰς ἀρχοντά τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.	For out of Thee shall come forth the Captain, that shall Rule my People Is- rael.	(e) Instead of Rule, the New-Te- stament, Printed An- no 1580. Translates Feed.	Corrected.
1 Peter, cap. 2. ver. 13.	(f) <i>Subiecti igi- tur estote omni hu- manæ Creaturæ πᾶσι ἀνθρώπων κτίσει, prop- ter Deum, siue Regi quasi Præcellenti si- ue Ducibus, &c. [βα- σιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι.]</i>	Be subject there- fore to every Hu- man Creature for God, whether it be to the King as Excelling, &c.	(f) In the latter end of King Henry VIII. and in Edward VI. Times, They translated, Submit your selves unto all manner of Or- dinance of Man, whether it be un- to the King, as to the Chief Head. In the Bible of 1577. To the King, as having Preheminence. In the Bible 1579. To the King, as the Superior.	Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King, as Su- pream.
Acts Apof. cap. 20. ver. 28.	(g) <i>Attendite vo- bis & universo Gresi in quo vos Spiritus Sanctus posuit Epif- copos Regere Eccle- siam Dei.</i> Ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνον- τες τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.	Take heed to your selves, and to the whole Flock, where- in the Holy - Ghost hath placed you Bi- shops to Rule the Church of God.	(g) — Where- in the Holy Ghost hath made you O- verseers, to Feed the Congregation of God.	— Wherein the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to Feed the Church of God.

(e) **I**T is certain, That this is a false Translation; because the Prophets Words (*Micb. 5.* cited by *St. Matthew*) both in *Hebrew* and *Greek*, signifie only a *Ruler* or *Governor*, and not a *Pastor* or *Feeder*. Therefore, it is either a great oversight, which is a small matter, in comparison of the least Corruption; or else it is done on purpose; which I the rather think, because they do the like in another place, (*Acts 20.*) as you may see below. And that to suppress the signification of Ecclesiastical Power and Government, that concurs with *Feeding*, first in *CHRIST*, and from Him in his Apostles and Pastors of the Church; both which are here signified in this one *Greek Word*, *ποιμαίνω*; to wit, That *CHRIST* our Saviour shall *Rule* and **Feed*; yea, He shall *Rule* in a Rod of Iron; And from Him, *St. Peter*, and the rest, by his Commission given in the same Word, *ποιμαίνω*, *Feed* and *Rule* my Sheep; yea, and that in a Rod of Iron: As when He struck *Ananias* and *Sapphira* to Corporal Death; as his Successors do the like Offenders to Spiritual Destruction (unless they Repent) by the Terrible Rod of Excommunication. This is imported in the double signification of the *Greek Word*, which They, to diminish Ecclesiastical Authority, rather Translate *Feed*, than *Rule* or *Govern*.

* Psalm 2.
Apocalip.
2. ver. 27.
Jo. 21.

(f) To the diminishing of this Ecclesiastical Authority, they Translated this Text of Scripture, (in King *Henry VIII.* and King *Edward VI.* Times) *Unto the King as the chief Head* (*1 Pet. 2.*) because then the King had first taken upon him this Title of *Supream Head of the Church*. And therefore they Flattered both Him, and his Young Son, till their Heresie was Planted; making the Holy Scripture say, That the King was the *Chief Head*, [which is all one with *Supream Head*.] But, in Queen *Elizabeth's* Time, being, it seems, better advised in that point, (by *Calvin*, I suppose, and the *Magdeburgenses*, who joyntly inveighed against that Title; and *Calvin*, against that, by Name, which was given to *Henry the VIII.*) and because, perhaps, they thought they could be bolder with a *Queen*, than with a *King*; as also, because then they thought their Reformation pretty well established; they began to Suppress this Title in their Translations, and to say, *To the King, as having Preheminence*, and, *To the King, as the Superior*; indeavouring (as may be supposed by this Translation) to Inroach upon that Ecclesiastical and Spiritual Jurisdiction they had formerly granted to the Crown.

Calvin in
c. 7. Amos.
Magdeb.
in Praef.
Cent. 7. fo
9, 10, 11.

But however that be, Let them either justify their Translation, or confess their Fault: And for the rest, I will refer them to the Words of *St. Ignatius*, who lived in the Apostles Time, and tells us, *That we must first Honour God, then the Bishop, then the King*; because in all things, *Nothing is comparable to God; and in the Church, nothing greater than the Bishop, who is Consecrated to God, for the Salvation of the whole World; and among Magistrates and Temporal Rulers, none is like the King.*

Ep. 7. as
Synonymis

(g) Again, Observe how they here suppress the Name *Bishop*, and translate *Overseers*; which is a Word, that has as much relation to a Temporal Magistrate, as to a Bishop. And this they do, because in King *Edward VI.* and Queen *Elizabeth's* Time, they had no Episcopal Consecration, but were made only by their Letters Patents*; which, I suppose, they will not deny, however, when they read of King *Edward VI.* making *John à Lasco* (a *Polonian*) Overseer or Superintendent, by His Letters Patents; and of their making one another Superintendants, or Pastors at *Frankfort*, by Election; and such only to continue for a time; or so long as themselves, or the Congregation pleased; and then to return again to the state of Private Persons, or Laymen; (*Vid. Hist. of the Troubles at Frankfort* †) and also of *K. Edward's* giving Power and Authority to *Cranmer*; And how *Cranmer*, when he made *Priests*, (by Election only, I suppose, because they were to continue no longer than the King pleased; whereas *Priests* truly Consecrated, are mark'd with an Indelible Character) pretended no other Authority for such Act, but only what he received from the King, by Vertue of his Letters Patents. *Fox To. 2. An. 1546, 1547.*

* Let. Pat.
Viench.
p. 71.
Fox To. 2.
in Ed. 6.
Regist. Ec-
cles. Lond.
Calvinos
p. 327.
† Hist. Frz.
pag. 51, 60.
62, 63, 72,
73, 74, 87.
97, 99, 125,
126, &c.
* Fitzherb.
Dr. Champ.
Nullity of
the English
Clergy. Prus.
demonst. &c.
† See Dr.
Bramhal,
pag. 98.
* Mason,
Bramh. &c.
† Dr. Eub.
Epist. de
Consecrat.
Minist.

And we have reason to judge, That *Mat. Parker*, and the rest of Queen *Elizabeth's* New Bishops, were no otherwise Made, than by the Queens Letters Patents; seeing, that the *Form*, devis'd by King *Edw. VI.* being Repeal'd by Queen *Mary*, was not again reviv'd till the 8 of *Q. Eliz.* [To say nothing of the Invalidity of the said *Form*; as having neither the Name of *Bishop* nor *Priest* in it], The like doubt of their Consecration, arises from the many and great Objections, made by *Catholic Writers**, against their pretended *Lambeth-Records* and Register: As also from the Consecrators of *M. Parker*, viz. *Barlow*, *Scorey*, &c. who we cannot believe to have been Consecrated themselves, unless first they can shew us Records of *Barlow's* Consecration; and secondly, tell us, by what *Form* of Consecration *Coverdale* and *Scorey* were made Bishops; the *Rom. Cath.* Ordinal having been Abrogated, and the New One not yet devised, at the Time that *Mason* says, they were Consecrated; which was, *Aug. 30. 1551.* And as for the *Suffragan*, there is such a difference about his Name †; some calling him *John*, some *Richard*; and about the place where he liv'd; some calling him *Suffragan of Bedford**, some of *Dover* †; that 'tis doubtful, there was no such Person present at that *Lambeth Ceremony*. But these things being fitter for another *Treatise*, (which, I hope, ere long, you may be presented with) I shall say no more of them in this place.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
1 Corinth. cap. 9. ver. 5.	(a) <i>Numquid non habemus potestatem Mulierem, Sororem [ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα] cir- cumducendi, &c.</i>	Have not we pow- er to lead about a Woman, a Sister? &c.	(a) Have we not power to lead a- bout a Wife, a Si- ster? &c.	Instead of <i>Woman</i> , they Translate <i>Wife</i> here also.
Philippians, cap. 4. ver. 3.	(b) <i>Etiam rogo & te Germane Com- par [ἐὺ ζῶντα γυναικα]</i>	Yea, and I beseech thee, my sincere <i>Companion</i> .	(b) For <i>Companion</i> , they say, <i>Yoke-Fel- low</i> .	--- <i>Yoke-Fellow</i> .
Hebrews, cap. 13. ver. 4.	(c) <i>Honorabile Connubium in omnibus [τίμιον ἡ γάμος ἐν πάντιν.] & Thorus immacula- tus.</i>	Marriage Honour- able in All, and the Bed undefiled.	(c) <i>Wedlock</i> is honourable among all <i>Men</i> , &c.	Marriage is Ho- nourable in All.
Matthew, cap. 19. ver. 11.	(d) <i>Qui dixit il- lis, Non omnes ca- piunt verbum istud, [ὅτι πάντες οὐ χωρεῖν.] sed quibus datum est.</i>	Who said to them, Not <i>All</i> take this <i>Word</i> ; but they to whom it is given.	(d) --- <i>All Men</i> cannot receive this saying, &c.	--- All Men can- not receive this say- ing, &c.
Matthew, cap. 19. ver. 12.	(e) <i>Et sunt Eu- nuchi qui seipso ca- straverunt [ἐυνύχισαν ὁ- μαυτοὺς] propter Regnum Cæ- lorum.</i>	And there are <i>Eunuchs</i> , which have <i>Gelded</i> themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven.	(e) <i>There</i> are some Chast, which have made them- selves Chast for the Kingdom of Hea- ven.	Corrected.

(a) **I**F, says St. Hierom, the Laity, or any of the Faithful, cannot Pray, unless he forbear Conjug. Duty, Priests, to whom it belongs to Offer Sacrifices for the People, are always to Pray; if to Pray always, therefore perpetually to live Single or Unmarried. But our late Pretended Reformers, the more to Prophane the Sacred Order of Priesthood, to which Continency and Single Life has always been annex'd in the New Testament, and to make it merely Laical and Popular, they will have all to be Married Men; yea, those that have Vow'd to the contrary: and it is a great Credit, among them, for Apostate Priests to take Wives. And therefore, by their falsly corrupting this Text of St. Paul, they will needs have him to say, That He, and the rest of the Apostles, Led their Wives about with them, (as K. Edward the Sixth's German-Apostles did theirs, when they came first into England, at the Call of the Lord Protector Seymour;) whereas the Apostle says nothing else, but a Woman, a Sister; meaning such a Christian Woman, as follow'd CHRIST, and the Apostles, to find, and maintain them of their Substance. So does St. Hierom Interpret it, and St. Augustin also; both directly proving, That it cannot be translated Wife: (b) Neither ought this Text to be translated Yoke-Fellow, as our Novelists do, on purpose to make it found in English, Man and Wife. Indeed, Calvin and Beza translate it in the Masculine Gender, for a Companion. And St. Theophilact, a Greek Father, saith, That if St. Paul had spoken to a Woman, it should have been γυναικα, in Greek. St. Paul says himself, He had no Wife, (1 Cor. 7.) And I think we have a little more reason to believe him, than those, who would gladly have him Married, on purpose to cloak the Sensuality of a few fallen Priests. In the first Chapter of the Acts, ver. 14. Beza translates, (Cum Uxoribus) With their Wives, because he would have all the Apostles there, reckoned for Married Men; whereas the Word is, [Cum Mulieribus] With the Women, as our English Translations also have it; because, in this place, they were assur'd to follow their Master Beza.

St. Hierom
lib. contr.
Frim. c. 19.
1 Cor. 7. 5.
35.

Lib. 1. ad
versu.
Jovinien
de op. man.
c. 4.
Lib. 2. c. 24.

(c) Again, For the Marriage of Priests, and all sorts of Men indifferently, they corrupt this Text, making two Falsifications in one Verse: The one is, Among all Men: The other, That they make it an affirmative Speech, by adding [Is;] whereas the Apostles Words are these, Marriage Honourable in All, and the Bed undefiled; which is rather an Exhortation; as if he should say, Let Marriage be Honourable in All, and the Bed undefiled; as appears, both by that which goes before, and that which follows immediately; all which are Exhortations. Let, therefore, Protestants give us a reason out of the Greek Text, why they translate the Words following, by way of Exhortation, Let your Conversation be without Covetousness; and not these Words also, in like manner, Let Marriage be Honourable in All? The Greek in both, is all one Phrase and Speech.

(d) Moreover, It is against the Profession of Continency in Priests and others, that they translate our Saviours Words of Single Life, and Unmarried State, thus, All Men cannot, &c. as tho' it were impossible to live Continent; where CHRIST said not, That all Men cannot; but, All Men DO not receive this saying. St. Augustin says, Whosoever have not this Gift [of Chastity] given them, 'tis either because they will not have it, or because they fulfil not that which they will: And they that have this word, have it of GOD, and their own Free-will.

Lib. de
Graua &
Lib. Ar-
bitr. c. 4.
* Trist. 7.
in Mauch.

This Gift, says Origen*, is given to all that Ask for it.

(e) Nor do they translate this Text exactly, nor, perhaps, with a sincere Meaning; for, if there be Chastity in Marriage, as well as in the Single Life, as Paphnutius, the Confessor, most truly said, and as Themselves are wont often to alledge; then their Translation doth nothing express our Saviours meaning, when they say, There are some Chast, which have made themselves Chast, &c. for a Man might say, All do so, who live Chastly in Matrimony. But our Saviour speaks of such as have Gelded themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven; not by cutting off these Parts which belong to Generation, for that were an Horrible and Mortal Sin; but by making themselves unable and impotent to Generation, by Promise, and Vow of perpetual Chastity, which is a Spiritual Gelding of themselves.

St. Basil calls the Marriage of the Clergy, Fornication, and not Matrimony. — Of Canonical Persons, says he, the Fornication must not be reputed Matrimony, because the Conjunction of these is altogether Prohibited; for this is altogether profitable for the Security of the Church. And in his Epistle to a certain Prelate, he cites these words out of the Council of Nice; 'Tis by the great Council forbidden, in all cases whatsoever, That it should be Lawful for a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, or for any whosoever, that are in Orders, to have a Woman live with them; except only their Mother, Sister, or Aunt, or such Persons as are void of all Suspicion.

St. Basil
Ep. 1. ad
Amphiloch.
Ep. 17. ad
Paregor.
Presbyt.
Conc. Nic.
in Cod.
Gra. Can.
3.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Acts Apof. cap. 19. ver. 3.	(a) <i>In quo [eis n] ergo Baptizati estis? qui dixerunt In Jo- hannis Baptismate.</i>	<i>In what then were you Baptized? who said, In John's Bap- tism.</i>	(a) <i>Unto what then were you Baptized? And they said, Unto John's Baptism.</i>	<i>Unto what then were ye Baptized? And they said, Unto John's Baptism.</i>
Titus cap. 3. ver. 5, 6.	(b) <i>Non ex operibus justitiæ quæ fecimus nos, sed secundum su- am Misericordiam salvos nos fecit, per lavacrum Regenerati- onis & Renovationis Spiritus Sancti; Quem effudit in nos abundè per Jesum Christum Salvatorem nostrum.</i>	<i>Not by the works of Justice, which we did; but according to his Mercy, He hath saved us; by the La- ver of Regeneration, and Renovation of the Holy Ghost, Whom he hath poured upon us abundantly, by Jesus Christ our Saviour.</i>	(b) <i>By the Fountain of the Re- generation of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us, &c.</i>	<i>Not by works of Righteousness, which we have done; but according to his Mercy, he saved us; by the Washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Ho- ly Ghost, Which he shed on us, &c.</i>

IN the beginning of the Reformation, they not only took away Five of the Seven Sacraments, but also depriv'd the rest of all *Grace, Vertue, and Efficacy*; making them no more than *Poor and Beggarly Elements*; at the most, no better than those of the *Jewish Law*. And this, because they would not have them any thing helpful, or necessary towards our Salvation; for the obtaining of which, they held and asserted, *That Faith alone was sufficient*.

For which reason, *Beza* was not content to say, with the Apostle, (*Rom. 4. ver. 11.*) *That Circumcision was a Seal of the Justice of Faith*; but because he thought that term too small for the Dignity of Circumcision, he (to use his own Words) gladly avoids it; putting the *Verb* instead of the *Noun*, [*Quod obsignaret, for Sigillum.*] And, in his Annotations upon the same place, he declares the reason of his so doing to be, The Dignity of Circumcision equal with any Sacrament in the *New Testament*: His words are, *What could be more magnifically spoken of any Sacrament? Therefore, they that put a real difference between the Sacraments of the Old Testament and Ours, never seem to have known how far Christ's Office extendeth: which he says, not to magnifie the Old, but disgrace the New.*

This is also the cause, why our First English Translators corrupted this (a) place in the *Acts*, to make no difference between *John's Baptism*, and *Christ's*, saying, *Unto what then were you Baptized? And they said, Unto John's Baptism.* Which *Beza* would have to be spoken of *John's Doctrine*, and not of his *Baptism in Water*; as if it had been said, *What Doctrine do ye Profess?* and they said, *John's*; Whereas, indeed, the Question is, *In what then? or, Wherein were you Baptized?* and they said, *In John's Baptism*: As if they would say, We have receiv'd *John's Baptism*, but not the *Holy Ghost*, as yet: Whence immediately follows, *Then they were Baptized in the Name of Jesus*; and after Imposition of Hands, *The Holy Ghost came upon them*: whence appears, the Insufficiency of *John's Baptism*; and the great difference between It and *CHRIST's*. And this so much troubles the *Beza's*, that *Beza* himself, expresses his Grief in these Words, *It is not necessary, that wheresoever there is mention of John's Baptism, we should think it the very Ceremony of Baptism: Therefore they, who gather that John's Baptism differs from CHRIST's, because These, a little after, are said to be Baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ, have no sure Foundation*: See his Annotations in *Acts 19.* Thus he endeavours to take away the Foundation of this Catholick conclusion, That *John's Baptism* differs, and is far Inferiour to *Christ's*.

Beza confesses, That the Greek [*eis ti*] is often us'd for *wherein* or *wherewith*; as it is in the *Vulgar Latin*, and *Erasmus*; but he, and his followers, think it signifies not so here; tho', but the Second Verse after, (*Ver. 5.*) the very same Greek Phrase [*eis to onoma*] is by them Translated [*In*]; where they say, *That they were Baptized In [not Unto] the Name of Jesus Christ.*

But no wonder, if they Disgrac'd the Baptism of *CHRIST*, when some * of them durst presume to take it quite away, by Interpreting these words of the Gospel; *Unless a Man be Born again of Water, and the Spirit, &c.* in this manner, *Unless a Man be Born again of Water, that is, the Spirit*; as if by *Water*, in this place, were only meant the *Spirit* Allegorically, and not material *Water*: As tho' our Saviour had said to *Nicodemus*, *Unless a Man be Born again of Water, I mean of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* To which purpose, *Calvin* as falsely translates the Apostles words to *Tism(b)*, thus, *Per lavacrum regenerationis Sp. Sancti, QUOD, effudit in nos abunde*; making the Apostle say, *That God poured the Water of Regeneration upon us abundantly*; that is, the *Holy Ghost*. And, lest we should not understand him, he tells us, in his Commentary on this place, *That the Apostle, speaking of Water poured out abundantly, speaks not of Material Water, but of the Holy Ghost*: Whereas the Apostle makes not *Water*, and the *Holy Ghost* all one; but most plainly distinguishes them; not saying, that *Water* was poured out upon us (as they would infer, by translating it, *Which he shed*) but the *Holy Ghost*, Whom he has poured out upon us abundantly: So that here is meant both the *Material Water*, or Washing of Baptism, and the Effect thereof, which is the *Holy Ghost* poured out upon us.

But, if I blame our English Translators, in this place, for making it indifferent, either, *Which Fountain, or Which Holy Ghost he shed, &c.* they will tell me, that the Greek is also indifferent: But, if we demand of them, whether the *Holy Ghost*, or rather a *Fountain of Water*, may be said to be *Shed*, they must doubtless confess, not the *Holy Ghost*, but *Water*: And consequently, their translating, *Which he shed*, instead of, *Whom he poured out*, would have it meant the *Fountain of Water*; thereby agreeing with *Calvin's* Translation, and *Beza's* Commentary: [For *Beza* in his Translation, refers it to the *Holy Ghost*, as *Catholicks* do.]

25. of the
39 Articles.

* *Beza* in
4. Jo. ver.
10. & in
Tit. c. 3. v.
5.

Calvin's
Translation
in Tit. c. 3.
ver. 5.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. James, cap. 5. ver. 16.	(a) Confitemini [ἰξουολογῶμεν] ergo al- ter utrum Peccata vestra.	Confess, therefore, your Sins one to a- nother.	(a) Acknowledge your Faults one to another.	Confess your Faults, &c.
St. Matth. cap. 11. ver. 21. Et Lucæ, cap. 10. ver. 13.	(b) — Si in Tyro & Sidone factæ essent virtutes quæ factæ sunt in vobis olim in Cilicio & Cinere Pœ- nitentiam egissent. [ματρινόμω.]	— If in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the Mira- cles that have been done in you, They had done Penance in Sack-Cloath and Ashes, long e're now.	(b) — Beza in all his Translations has, — They had amended their Lives. And our other Translations say, They would have Repented.	— Instead of, They had done Penance; they say, They would have Repented.
St. Matth. cap. 3. ver. 2.	Pœnitentiam agi- te appropinquabit e- nim Regnum Cælorum.	Do Penance, for the Kingdom of Hea- ven is at hand.	Repent, for the Kingdom of Hea- ven is at hand.	Repent, &c.
St. Lucæ, cap. 3. ver. 3.	— Predicans Bap- tismum Pœnitentiæ.	— Preaching the Baptism of Penance.	— Preaching the Baptism of Repentance.	— Preaching the Baptism of Repen- tance.
St. Lucæ, cap. 3. ver. 8.	Facite ergo fructus dignos Pœnitentiæ.	Yield, therefore, Fruits worthy of Pe- nance.	— Worthy of Repentance. Beza says, Do Fruits meet for them that amend their lives.	— Fruit worthy of Repentance.
Acts Apof. cap. 2. ver. 38.	Petrus vero ad il- los Pœnitentiam (in quit) agite & Bapti- zetur, unusquisque ve- strum in nomine Jesu Christi.	But Peter said to them, Do Penance, and be every one of you Baptized, in the Name of Jesus Christ.	— Repent, and be every one of you Baptized, &c.	— Repent, and be Baptized, &c.

(A) TO avoid this Term [Confession], especially in this place, (whence the Reader might easily gather *Sacramental Confession*), they thus falsify the Text. It is said, a little before, *If any be Sick, let him bring in the Priests, &c.* And then it follows, *Confess your Sins, &c.* But they, to make sure work, say, *Acknowledge*, instead of *Confess*; and for *Priests, Elders*; and for *Sins*, they had rather say, *Faults*; [*Acknowledge your Faults*] to make it sound, among the Ignorant common People, as different as they can, from the usual Catholick Phrase, *Confess your Sins*. What mean they by this? If this Acknowledging of *Faults* one to another, before Death, be indifferently to be made to all Men; why do they appoint in their *Common-Prayer Book* * (as it seems, out of this place), That the Sick Person shall make a special Confession to the Minister; and he shall Absolve him in the very same Form of Absolution that *Catholick Priests* use in the Sacrament of Penance? — And again, seeing themselves acknowledge Forgiveness of Sins by the Minister, why do they not reckon Penance, of which Confession is a part, amongst the Sacraments? But, I suppose, when they translated their Bibles, they were of the same Judgment with the Ministers of the Diocese of Lincoln, who Petitioned to have the words of Absolution blotted out of the *Common-Prayer Book*: But when they Visit the Sick, they are of the Judgment of *Roman Catholics*, who, at this day, hold Confession and Absolution necessary to Salvation, as did also the *Primitive Christians*: witness *St. Basil*; *Sins must necessarily be opened unto them, unto whom the Dispensation of God's Mysteries is committed*. *St. Ambrose*; *If thou desirest to be justify'd, confess thy Sin; For a shame-fac'd Confession of Sins, dissolves the Knot of Iniquity*.

* Visitation of the Sick.

Survey of the Common Prayer Book.

St. Basil. in Regulâ brevioris Interrogatione 183. St. Ambros. lib. de poenit. cap. 6.

St. Basil in Psalm 19. St. Aug. Hom. 27. In Jer. 50 H. Es Ep. 108. Sozom. lib. 7. c. 15. See S. Hieron in Epitaph. Fabian.

Socrat. lib. 5. c. 19.

† Council Laodicea Can. 3, Can. 9, & 19. 1 Council Nicen. Can. 12. St. Basil. Cap. 1. ad Amphilocho

St. Aug. Ep. 103.

As for Penance, and Satisfaction for Sins, they utterly deny it, upon the Heresie of, *Only Faith justifying, and Saving a Man*. *Beza* protests, That he avoids these terms, *penitentia, Pœnitentia*, and *penitentiæ*, *Pœnitentiam agite*, of purpose: And says, That in translating these Greek words, he will always use, *Resipiscencia*, and *Resipiscite*, *Amendment of Life*, and *Amend your Lives*. And our *English Bibles*, to this day, dare not venture on the word Penance, but only Repentance; which is not only far different from the Greek Word, but even from the very circumstances of the Text; as is evident from those of *St. Matth. 11.* and *Luke 10.* where these words, *Sack-Cloth and Ashes*, cannot but signifie more than the word Repentance, or Amendment of Life can be drawn to; as is plain from these words of *St. Basil*, *Sack cloth makes for Penance; for the Fathers, in Old Time, sitting in Sack-cloth and Ashes, did Penance*. Do not *St. John Baptist*, and *St. Paul*, plainly signifie Penitential Works, when they exhort us to do Fruits worthy of Penance? Which Penance *St. Augustin* thus declares, *There is a more grievous, and more mournful Penance, whereby properly they are called in the Church, that are Penitents; remov'd also from partaking the Sacrament of the Altar*. And *Sozomen*, in his Ecclesiastical History, says, *In the Church of Rome, there is a manifest and known place for the Penitents, and in it they stand Sorrowful, and as it were Mourning; and when the Sacrifice is ended, being not made Partakers thereof, with Weeping and Lamentations they cast themselves flat on the Ground: Then the Bishop, Weeping also with Compassion, lifts them up; and after a certain time enjoy'd, Absolves them from their PENANCE*. This the Priests or Bishops of Rome keep, from the very Beginning, even until our Time.

Not only *Sozomen*, but *Socrates* also, and all the Ancient Fathers, when they speak of Penitents, that Confessed and Lamented their Sins, and were enjoy'd Penance, and perform'd it, did always express it in the said Greek Words; which, therefore, are prov'd most evidently to signifie Penance, and doing Penance. Again, when the Ancient Council of *Laodicea* † says; That the time of Penance should be given to Offenders, according to the proportion of the Fault: And that such shall not Communicate till a certain Time; but after they have Done Penance, and Confess'd their Fault, then to be Receiv'd: And when the First Council of *Nice* speaks about shortning or prolonging the days of Penance: When *St. Basil* speaks after the same sort: When *St. Chrysostome* calls the Sack-cloth and Fasting of the *Ninevites*, for certain days, *Tot diurnum Pœnitentiam*, *So many days of Penance*: In all these places, I would demand of our Translators of the *English Bible*, if all these Speeches of Penance, and doing Penance, are not express'd by the said Greek Words? And I would ask them, Whether in these places, where there is mention'd a Prescript time of Satisfaction for Sin, by such and such Penal means, they will translate Repentance, and Amendment of Life, Only? — Moreover, the *Latin Church*, and all the Ancient Fathers thereof, have always read, as the *Vulgar Latin Interpreter* translates, and do all express'd the same Penance, and doing Penance: For example, see *St. Augustin*, amongst others; where you will find it plain, that he speaks of Painful or Penitential Works, for satisfaction of Sins.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.</i>	<i>The Last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
St. Luke, cap. 1. ver. 28.	(a) <i>Ave gratia plena, Dominus te- cum,</i> [καταειπμὲν.]	Hail, full of Grace, our Lord is with thee.	(a) Hail, Thou that art freely be- loved. In Bib. 1577. Thou that art in high favour.	Hail, Thou that art highly favoured, our Lord is with thee.
St. Matth. cap. 1. ver. 25.	(b) <i>Et vocavit nomen ejus Jesum.</i> [καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.]	And called His Name Jesus.	(b) And he cal- led his Name Je- sus.	And He called his Name Jesus.
Genesis, cap. 3. ver. 15.	(c) <i>Ipsa conteret caput tuum, & tu insidiaberis calcaneo ejus.</i>	She shall bruise thy Head in pieces, and thou shalt lie in wait for Her Heel.	(c) It shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise His heel.	It shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.
II St. Peter, cap. 1. ver. 15.	(d) <i>Dabo autem operam & frequenter habere vos post obitum meum, ut horum me- moriam faciatis.</i>	And I will do my endeavour, you to have often after my Decease also, that you may keep a Memory of these things.	(d) I will en- deavour, that you may be able, after my Decease, to have these things always in remem- brance.	I will endeavour, that you may be able after my Decease, to have these things al- ways in remem- brance.
Psalms 138. Eng. Bib. 139. ver. 17.	(e) <i>Nimis honori- ficati sunt amici tui,</i> [וְהַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ Deus; Nimis confor- tatus est principatus eorum [וְהַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֵל אֱדָרְכֵנוּ.]	Thy Friends, O God, are become ex- ceeding Honourable; their Principedome is exceedingly streng- thened.	(e) How dear are thy Councils (or Thoughts) to me? O how great is the Summ of them?	How precious also are thy Thoughts unto me? O God! How great is the Summ of them.

(a) THE most B. Virgin, and Glorious Mother of CHRIST, has, by GOD's Holy Church, always been Honoured with most Magnificent Titles and Addresses: One of the first Four General Councils, gives Her the Transcendent Title of the Mother of GOD. And by St. Cyril of Alexandria, She is saluted in these words, *Hail, Holy Mother of GOD, Rich Treasure of the World, Ever shining Lamp, Crown of Purity, and Scepter of true Doctrine; by Thee the Holy Trinity is every where Blessed and Adored, the Heavens Exult, Angels rejoice, and Devils are Chased from us: Who so surpasses in Eloquence, that he is able to say enough to the Glory of Mary? Yea, the Angel Gabriel is Commissioned from GOD, to Address himself to Her with this Salutation, HAIL, FULL OF GRACE.* Since which time, what has ever been more common, and, at this day, more general and usual in all Christian Countries, than in the *Ave Maria*, to say, *Gratia Plena, Full of Grace?* But, in our miserable Land, that Holy Prayer, which every Child us'd to say, is not only Banish'd, but the very Text of Scripture where our Blessed Lady was by the Angel saluted by, *Hail, full of Grace*, they have chang'd into another manner of Salutation, viz. *Hail, thou that art freely Beloved*, or, *in high Favour*. I would glad'y know of them, why This, or That, or any other thing, rather than *Hail, full of Grace?* St. John Baptist was full of the Holy Ghost, even from his Birth. St. Stephen was full of Grace; why may not then our Lady be called *Full of Grace*, who, as St. Ambrose says, *Only obtained the Grace which no other Woman deserved, To be replenish'd with the Author of Grace?*

If they say, The Greek Word does not so signifie; I must ask them, why they translate *καρτερικόν*, *Ulcerosus, Full of Sores*, and will not translate, *χαριστήριον*, *Gratiosa, Full of Grace?* Let them tell us what difference there is in the Nature and Significancy of these two Words. If *Ulcerosus* (as Beza translates it) be *Full of Sores*, why is not *Gratiosa* (as Erasmus translates it) *Full of Grace?* seeing that all such Adjectives in *osus* signifie *Fullness*, as *Periculosus, Erummosus*, &c. as every School-Boy knows. What Syllable is there in this Word, that seems to make it signifie *freely Beloved?* St. Chrysostome, and the Greek Doctors, that should best know the nature of this Greek Word, say, That it signifies to make *Gracious* and *Acceptable*. St. Athanasius, a Greek Doctor, says; That our Blessed Lady had this Title, *καρτερικόν*, because the Holy Ghost descended into Her, filling Her with all *Graces* and *Virtues*. And St. Hierom reads *Gratia Plena*, and says plainly, She was so Saluted, *Full of Grace*, because she Conceived Him in whom all fullness of the Deity dwelt Corporally.

(b) Again, To take from the Holy Mother of GOD, what Honour they can, They translate, That He, (viz. Joseph) called his Name JESUS: And why not She, as well as He? For in St. Luke, the Angel saith to our Lady also, *THOU shalt call his Name JESUS.* Have we not much more reason to think that the B. Virgin, the Natural Mother of our Saviour, gave Him the Name, JESUS, than Joseph, his reputed Father; seeing also St. Matthew, in this place, limits it neither to Him nor Her? And the Angel reveal'd the Name first unto Her, saying, That She should so call Him. And the Hebrew Word, *Esa. 7.* whereunto the Angel alludes, is the Feminine Gender; and by the Great Rabbins referr'd unto Her, saying expressly, in their Commentaries, *Et vocabis ipsa Puella*, &c. And the Maid her self shall call His Name JESUS.

(c) How ready our New Controulers of Antiquity, and the approved Ancient Latin Translation, are to find Fault with this Text, *Gen. 3. She shall bruise thy Head*, &c. because it appertains to our B. Lady's Honour; saying, That all Ancient Fathers read *I sum*: When, on the contrary, St. Chrysostome, St. Ambrose, St. Augustin, St. Gregory, St. Bede, St. Bernard, and many others, read *Ipsa*, as the Latin Text now does. And tho' some have read otherwise; Yet, whether we read, *She shall bruise*, or *Her Seed*, that is, Her Son, Christ Jesus, we attribute no more, nor no less to Christ, nor to his Mother, by this reading, or by that; as you may see, if you please to read the Annotations upon this place, in the Downy Bible. I have spoke of this in the Preface.

(d) Where the Scripture, in the Original, is ambiguous and indifferent to divers Senses, it ought not to be restrain'd or limited by Translation, unless there be a mere necessity, when it can hardly express the ambiguity of the Original: As for Example, In this where St. Peter speaks so ambiguously, either that he will remember them after his Death, or that they shall remember him. But the Calvinists restrain the Sense of this pl. without any necessity; and that against the Prayer and Intercession of Saints for us, contrary to the Judgment of some of the Greek Fathers; who concluded from it, *That the Saints in Heaven, remember us on Earth, and make Intercession for us.*

(e) In fine, This Verse of the Psalm, which is by the Church, and all Antiquity, read thus, and both Sung and said in Honour of the Holy Apostles, agreeably to that in another Psalm, *Thou shalt appoint them Princes over all the Earth*: They translate contrary both to the Hebrew, and the Greek, which is altogether according to the said Ancient Latin Translation, *[How are the Heads of them strengthen'd, or their Princeloms]*: And this they do, on purpose to detract from the Honour of the Apostles and Holy Saints.

Conc. Eph.
cap. 13.

St. Luke 1.
ver. 18.

St. Luke, 1.
ver. 15.
A2. 7. 8.

Luke 16.
ver. 20.

St. Chryl.
Comment
in Ep. 1.
St. Athan.
de S. Deipa.
St. Hierom.
in Ep. 140.
in Expi.
Psal. 44.

Rabbi A-
braham, &
Rabbi Da-
vid.
See the An-
notat. upon
this place
in the Do-
way Bible.

Occur. in
Caten. Gay-
nutt in
hunc locum
Paul. 44.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Hebrews, cap. 11. ver. 21.	(a) <i>Fide Jacob moriens singulos filiorum Joseph benedixit, & adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus.</i> [πρεσβυτέρων ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ τοῦ Ἰακώβου αὐτοῦ.]	By Faith, Jacob dying, blessed every one of the Sons of Joseph, and <i>Adored</i> the top of his Rod.	(a) ----- And leaning on the end of his Staff, Worshipped God.	By Faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed both the Sons of Joseph, and <i>Worshipped, leaning upon the top of his Staff.</i>
Genesis, cap. 47. ver. 31.	(b) <i>Adoravit Israel Deum, conversus ad Lectuli caput.</i> ישתחו על ראש הלקט	Israel Adored God, turning to the Beds-head.	(b) Israel Worshipped God towards the Beds-head.	And Israel <i>Bowed himself upon</i> the Beds-head.
Psalm, 98. ver. 5. Eng. Bib. 99.	<i>Exaltate Dominum Deum nostrum, & adorate scabellum pedum ejus, quoniam sanctum est.</i>	Exalt the Lord our God, and adore <i>ye the Foot-stool</i> of his Feet, because it is Holy.	Exalt the Lord our God, and fall down before his Foot-stool, for he is Holy.	Exalt the Lord our God, and <i>Worship at his Foot-stool, for he is Holy.</i>
Psalm 131. ver. 7. Eng. Bib. 132.	<i>Introibimus in tabernaculum ejus, Adorabimus in loco, ubi steterunt pedes ejus.</i>	We will enter into his Tabernacle, we will adore in the place where his Feet stood.	----- We will fall down before his Foot-stool.	We will go into his Tabernacles, we will <i>Worship at his Foot-stool.</i>

THE Sacred Council of *Trent* decrees, that, *The Images of CHRIST, of the Virgin Mother of GOD, and of other Saints, are to be Had and Retained, especially in Churches; and that due Honour and Worship is to be Imparted unto them: Not for that any Divinity is believed to be in them; or Virtue, for which they are to be Worshipped; or that any thing is to be beg'd of them; or that Hope is to be put in them; as, in Times past, the Pagans did, who put their Trust in Idols; but because the Honour which is exhibited to them, is refer'd to the first Pattern, which they resemble: So that, by the Images which we Kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads, and Kneel, we Adore CHRIST and His Saints, whose Likeness they bear.* And the Second Council of *Nice*, which confirm'd the Ancient Reverence due to Sacred Images, tells us, *That these Images the Faithful salute with a Kiss, and give an Honorary Worship to them, but not the true LATRIA or Divine Worship, which is according to Faith, and can be given to none besides GOD himself.* Between which degrees of Worship [*Latria & Dulia*] Protestants are so loath to make any distinction, that, in this place (a), they restrain the Scripture to the Sense of One Doctor; insomuch that they make the Commentary of *St. Augustin* (peculiar to him alone) the very Text of Scripture, in their Translation; thereby excluding all other Sences and Expositions of other Fathers; who either Read and Expound, that *Jacob Ador'd the top of Joseph's Scepter*; or else, that *He Adored towards the top of his Scepter*: Besides which two Sences, there is no other Interpretation of this place, in all Antiquity, but in *St. Augustin* only, as *Beza* himself confesses: And here they add two words more than are in the *Greek* Text, [*Leaning and God*]; forcing *ἀντὶ* to signify *ἀντὶς*, which may be, but is as rare as *Virge ejus*, for *Virga sue*; and turning the other words clear out of their Order, Place, and form of Construction, which they must needs have correspondent and answerable to the *Hebrew* Text, from whence they were translated; which *Hebrew* words themselves translate in this order, *He Worshipped towards the Bed-head*; and if so, according to the *Hebrew*, then did he worship toward the top of his Scepter, according to the *Greek*; the difference of both being only in these words, *Scepter* and *Bed*; because the *Hebrew* is ambiguous to both, and not in the Order and Construction of the Sentence.

But why is it, that they thus boldly add in one place, and take away in another? Why do they add [*Leaning and God*] in one Text, and totally suppress [*Worshipped God*] in another? Is it not because they are afraid, lest those Expressions might warrant and confirm the Catholick and Christian manner of Adoring our Saviour *CHRIST* toward the Holy Cross, or before his Image, the Crucifix, the Altar, &c.? And tho' they make so much of the *Greek* Particle [*ἐν*] as to translate it, *Leaning upon*, rather than *towards*; yet the Ancient *Greek* Fathers * put so little force in it, that they expounded and read the Text, as if it were of Phrase only, and not of any signification at all; saying, *Jacob adored Joseph's Scepter; The People of Israel adored the Temple, the Ark, the Holy Mount, the place where his Feet stood, and the like*: Whereby *St. Damascene* proves the Adoration of Creatures, named *Dulia*; to wit, of the Cross, and of Sacred Images. If, I say, these Fathers make so little force of the Prepositions, as to Infer from these Texts, not only Adoration towards the Thing, but Adoration of the thing; how come these, our New Translators, thus to strain and rack the little Particle [*ἐν*] as to make it signify *Leaning upon*, and utterly to exclude it from signifying any thing tending towards Adoration?

I would gladly know of them, Whether in these places of the *Psalms* there be any force in the *Hebrew* Prepositions? surely, no more, than if we should say in *English*, without Prepositions, *Adore ye his Holy Hill: We will Adore the place where his Feet stood: Adore ye his Foot-stool*; for they know, there is the same Preposition also, when it is said, *Adore ye our Lord*; or, as themselves translate it, *Worship the Lord*; where there can be no force nor signification of the Preposition: And therefore, in these places, their Translation is corrupt and wilful; when they say, *We will fall down before, or, at his Foot-stool, &c.* Where they shun and avoid, First, The term of Adoration, which the *Hebrew* and *Greek* duly express, by terms correspondent in both Languages, throughout the Bible, and are applyed, for the most part, to signify Adoring of Creatures. Secondly, They avoid the *Greek* Phrase, which is, at the least, to Adore towards these Holy things and places: And much more the *Hebrew* Phrase, which is, to Adore the very things Rehearsed. To Adore God's Foot-stool, (as the *Psalmist* saith) because it is Holy, or, because He is Holy, whose Foot-stool it is, as the *Greek* readeth. And *St. Augustin*, so precisely and Religiously reads, *Adore ye his Foot-stool*, that he examines the Case; and finds, thereby, that the Blessed Sacrament must be Adored, and that no Good Christian Takes it, before he Adores it.

Concil. Tri-
dent. Sess.
25.

2 Concil.
Nice. 48. 7.

* St. Chrys.
Occum. in
Collection.
S. Damasc.
lib. 1. pro
Imaginib.
Leon. ap-
ud Damasc.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
Collossians cap. 3. ver. 5.	(a) — <i>Et Avaritiam quæ est Simulacrorum Servitus.</i> [εἰδωλατρεια.]	— And Avarice, which is the Service of <i>Idols</i> .	(a) — And Covetousness, which is the Worshipping of Images.	— And Covetousness, which is Idolatry.
Ephesians, cap. 5. ver. 5.	— <i>Aut Avarus, quod est Idolorum servitus.</i>	— Or Covetous Person, which is the Service of <i>Idols</i> .	— Or Covetous Man, which is a Worshipper of Images.	Corrected.
2 Corinth. cap. 6. ver. 16.	(b) <i>Quis autem consensus Templo Dei cum Idolis?</i> [εἰδωλον.]	And what agreement hath the Temple of God with <i>Idols</i> ?	(b) How agreeth the Temple of God with Images?	Corrected.
1 Ep. John, cap. 5. ver. 21.	<i>Filioli custodite vos à Simulacris.</i> [εἰδωλον.]	My little Children, keep your selves from <i>Idols</i> .	Babes, keep your selves from Images.	Corrected.
1 Corinth. cap. 10. ver. 7.	<i>Neque Idololatraz [εἰδωλαστρα] efficiamini sicut quidam ex ipsis.</i>	Neither become ye <i>Idolaters</i> , as certain of them.	Be not Worshipers of Images, as some of them.	Corrected also in this.

(a) **B**Efore I proceed in this, let me ask our *English* Translators, What is the most proper, and best *English* of *ἰδωλάν, εἰδωλατρίας, εἰδωλατρία*; *Idolum, Idolatrum, Idolatria*? Is it not *Idol, Idolater, Idolatry*? Are not these plain *English* words, and well known in our Language? Why then need they put three Words for one, [*Worshipper of Images*,] and [*Worshipping of Images*?] Whether is the more natural and convenient Speech, either in our *English* Tongue, or for the Truth of the thing, to say, as the Holy Scripture does, *Covetousness is Idolatry*; and consequently, *The Covetous Man is an Idolater*: or to say, as their first Absurd Translations have it, *Covetousness is Worshipping of Images*, and the *Covetous Man is a Worshipper of Images*? I suppose, they will scarce deny, but that there are many *Covetous Protestants*, and, perhaps, of their Clergy too, that may be put in the List with those, of whom the Apostle speaks, when he says, there are some whose Belly is their God: And tho' these make an *Idol* of their Money and their Bellies, by *Covetousness* and *Gluttony*; yet they would doubtless take it ill from us, if in their own Scripture-Language, we should call them *Worshippers of Images*. Who sees not, therefore, what great difference there is between *Idol* and *Image, Idolatry* and *Worshipping of Images*? Even so much is there between *St. Paul's* Words, and the *Protestant* Translation; but because in their latter Translations they have Corrected this shameful Absurdity, I will say no more of it.

(b) In this other, not only their Malice, but their full intent and set-purpose of deluding the poor simple People appears; This Translation being made, when *Images* were plucking down throughout *England*, to create in the People a Belief, That the Apostle spake against Sacred *Images* in Churches; whereas his words are against the *Idols*, and *Idolatry* of the *Gentiles*; as is plain from what goes before, exhorting them not to joyn with Infidels: for, says he, *How agreeth the Temple of God with Idols*? [not, with *Images*] for *Images* might be had without Sin, as we see the *Jews* had the *Images* of the *Cherubims*, and the *Figures* of *Oxen* in the *Temple*, and the *Image* of the *Brazen Serpent* in the *Wilderness*, by *GOD's* Appointment; tho', as soon as they began to make an *Idol* of the *Serpent*, and Adore it as their God, it could no longer be kept without Sin. By this corrupt custom of translating *Image*, instead of *Idol*, they so bewitched their deceived Followers, as to make them despise, contemn, and abandon, even the very Sign and Image of Salvation, the Cross of *CHRIST*, and the Crucifix; whereby the manner of his bitter Death and Passion is represented; notwithstanding their signing and marking their Children with it in their Baptism, when they are first made Christians.

By such wilful Corruptions, in these and other Texts; as, *Be not Worshipers of Images, as some of them*; and, *Babes, keep your selves from Images*, which, the more to Impress in the Minds of the Vulgar, they writ upon their Church Walls; The People were animated to break down, and cast out of their Churches, the Image of our Blessed Saviour, His Blessed Mother, and the Twelve Apostles, &c. with so full and general a resolution of defacing and extirpating all Tokens or Marks of our Saviour's Passion, that they broke down the very Crosses from the tops of Church-Steeple, where they could easily come to them. And tho', in their latter Translations, they have corrected this Corruption; yet do some of the People so freshly, to this day, retain the Malice impress'd by it upon their Parents, that they have presum'd to break the Cross, lately set on the Pinnacle of the Porch of *Westminster-Abbey*: And the more to shew their spight towards that Sacred Sign of our Redemption, the Holy Cross, plac'd it, not long since, upon the Foreheads of *Bulls* and *Mastiff Dogs*; and so drove them in the Streets of *London*, to the Eternal shame of such as receive it in their Baptism, and pretend to Christianity. What could *Jews* or *Infidels* have done more? Was it not enough to break it down from the tops of Churches, and to put up the Image of a *Dragon* (the Figure wherein the Devil himself is usually represented) as upon *Bow-Church**, in the mid't of the City, but they must place it so contemptuously in the Foreheads of Beasts and Dogs?

In how great esteem the Holy Cross was had by Primitive Christians, the Fathers of those days have sufficiently testify'd in their Writings: *This Cross*, says *St. Chrysostome*, *We may see solemnly us'd in Houses, in the Market, in the Desert, in the Ways, on Mountains and Hills, in Valleys, &c.* Contrary to which, the Pretended Reformers of our Times, have not only cast it out of their Houses, but out of their Churches also: They have broken it down from all *Market-places*, from *Hills, Mountains, Valleys*, and *High-ways*: So that in all the Roads in *England*, there is not One Cross left standing entire, that I have ever heard of, except one called † *Ralph Cross* (which I have often seen) upon a Wild-Heath or Mountain, near *Danby* Forreth, in the *North Riding* of *York* shire.

* Why might not a Cuck, (the Animal by which our Saviour was pleased to admonish St. Peter of his Sin) have been plac'd upon Covent-Garden Church, rather than a Serpent or a Cross on Bow Church rather than a Dragon?

† The Inhabitants of Danby, Rofdale, Welterdale, and Farn-dale may glory before all parts in England, that they have a Cross standing to this day entire, in the mid't of them.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
1 Corinth. cap. 5. ver. 9, 10.	(a) <i>Scripti vobis in Epistola ne commisceamini fornicariis, non utique fornicariis huius Mundi, aut Avaris, aut rapacibus, aut Idolis Servientibus, [εἰδωλόδτραις] alioquin debueratis de hoc Mundo exisse: Nunc autem scripsi vobis non commisceri; si is qui Frater nominatur, est fornicator aut avarus, aut Idolis Serviens, &c. εἰδωλόδτραις.</i>	I wrote to you in an Epistle, not to keep Company with Fornicators; I mean, not the Fornicators of this World, or the Covetous, or the Extortioners, or <i>Servers of Idols</i> ; otherwise you should have gone out of this World. But now I have writ to you, not to keep Company; if he that is named a Brother be a Fornicator or Covetous Person, or a <i>Server of Idols</i> , &c.	(a) I wrote to you, that you should not Company with Fornicators: And I meant not all of the Fornicators of this World, either of the Covetous or Extortioners, either the Idolaters, &c. But that ye Company not together; if any that is called a Brother, be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or a Worshipper of Images, &c.	It is Corrected in this Bible.
Romans, cap. 11. ver. 4.	(b) <i>Reliqui mihi septem millia virorum qui non curvaverunt Genua ante Baal.</i>	I have left me Seven Thousand Men that have not bowed their Knees to Baal.	I have left me seven Thousand Men that have not bowed their knees to the Image of Baal.	I have left me seven Thousand Men that have not bowed their Knees to the Image of Baal.
Acts Apoc. cap. 19. ver. 35.	<i>Viri Ephesti quis enim est Hominum qui nesciat Ephestorum civitatem cultricem esse Magnæ Dianæ & Jovis prolis? τῆς διοπατρὸς;</i>	Ye Men of Ephesus, for what Man is there that knoweth not the City of the Ephesians, to be a Worshipper of Great Diana, and Jupiter's Child?	Instead of <i>Jupiters Child</i> , they translate, <i>The Image which came down from Jupiter.</i>	And here they translate, <i>The Image which fell down from Jupiter.</i>
Exodus, cap. 20. ver. 4.	<i>Non facies tibi Sculptile 𐤇𐤍𐤔 𐤀𐤃𐤁𐤏𐤓.</i>	Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven thing.	Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image.	Thou shalt not make to thee any Graven Image. How

(a) **H**OW Malitious and Heretical was their Intention, who, in this one Sentence, made St. Paul seem to speak two distinct things, calling the *Pagans*, [*Idolaters*], and such Wicked Christians as should commit the same Impiety, [*Worshippers of Images*]; whereas the Apostle uses but one and the self-same *Greek Word*, in speaking both of *Pagans* and *Christians*? It is a wilful and most notorious Corruption; for in the first place, speaking of *Pagans*, the Translator, according to the Text, names *Idolater*; but in the latter part of the Verse, speaking of *Christians*, they translate the very self-same *Greek Word*, *Worshipper of Images*. And what reason had they for this, but to make the Simple and Ignorant Reader think, that St. Paul speaks here not only of *Pagan Idolaters*, but also of *Catholick Christians*, that Reverently kneel in Prayer before the Holy Cross, or Images of our Saviour *CHRIST*, and his Saints; as tho' the Apostle had commanded such to be avoided? All the other Words, *Covetous*, *Fornicators*, *Extortioners*, they translated alike, in both places, both of *Pagans* and *Christians*: Only this Word [*Idolaters*] not so, but *Pagans*, *Idolaters*; and *Christians*, *Worshippers of Images*. Was not this done on purpose, to make both seem all One; and to signify that *Christians*, doing Reverence before Sacred Images (which *Protestants* call *Worshipping of Images*) are more to be avoided than the *Pagan Idolaters*: Whereas the Apostle, speaking of *Pagans* and *Christians* that committed one and the self-same Heinous Sin whatsoever, commands the *Christian* in that case to be avoided for his amendment, leaving the *Pagan* to himself, and to *GOD*, as having not to do to judge him.

(b) Besides their falsly translating *Image* instead of *Idol*, they have also another way of falsifying and corrupting the Scripture, by thrusting the word *Image* into the Text, when in the *Hebrew* or *Greek* there is no such thing; as in these notorious Examples, *To the Image of Baal: The Image that came down from Jupiter*: where they are not content to understand *Image* rather than *Idol*, but they must intrude it into the Text, tho' they know full well it is not in the *Greek*.

Not unlike to this kind of Falsification, is that which is crept as a Leprosie through all their Bibles, and which, it seems, they are resolv'd never to Correct; viz. Their translating *Sculptile* and *Constatile*, *Graven Image*, and *Molten Image*; namely, in the First Commandment; where they cannot be Ignorant, that in the *Greek* it is *Idol*, and in the *Hebrew*, such a Word as signifies only a *Graven thing*, not including this word *Image*. They know that *GOD* commanded to make the Images of *Cherubins*, and of *Oxen*, in the Temple, and of the *Brazen Serpent* in the Desert; and therefore their Wisdoms might have considered, that he forbid not all *Graven Images*, but such as the *Gentiles* Made, and Worshipped for Gods; and therefore, *Non facies tibi Sculptile*, concurs with those words that go before, *Thou shalt have none other Gods but me*. For so to have an Image as to make it a God, is to make it more than an Image: and therefore, when it is an *Idol*, as were the *Idols* of the *Gentiles*, then it is forbid by this Commandment. Otherwise, when the Cross stood many Years upon the Table, in Queen *Elizabeth's* Chappel, pray was it against this Commandment? Or was it Idolatry in Her Majesty, and Her Councillors, that appointed it there? Or do their Brethren the *Lutherans* beyond Seas, at this day, commit Idolatry against this Commandment, who have in their Churches the *Crucifix*, and the Holy Images of the Mother of *God*, and of St. *John* the Evangelist? Or if the whole Story of the Gospel, concerning our Saviour *Christ*, were drawn in Pictures and Images in their Churches, as it is in many of Ours, would they say, it were a breach of this Commandment? *Fie for shame! fie for shame!* that they should with such Intollerable Impudence and Deceit, abuse and bewitch the Ignorant People, against their own Knowledge and Consciences.

For do they not know, that *God* many times forbid the *Jews*, both Marriages, and other Conversation with the *Gentiles*, lest they might fall to Worship their *Idols* as *Solomon* did, and as the *Psalms* reports of them? This then is the meaning of the Commandment, neither to make the *Idols* of the *Gentiles*, nor any other like unto them; and to that end, as did *Ferobas* in *Dan* and *Beikel*. By this Commandment we are forbidden, (not to make Images, but) to make *Idols*, or to Worship Images, or any thing else as *God*. I do not, says St. *Jo. Damascene*, *Worship an Image as God*; but by the Images and Saints, I give Adoration and Honour to *God*, for whose sake I respect and reverence those that are his Friends. All over the World, says Pope *Adrian I.*, wheresoever Christianity is Profess'd, Sacred Images are Honour'd by all the Faithful, &c. By the Image of the Body, which the Son of *God* took for our Redemption, we Adore our Redeemer who is in Heaven; For, far be it from us, that we (as some Calumniare) should make Gods of Images: We only express the Love and Zeal we have for *God*, and his Saints: And as we keep the Books of the Holy Scripture, so do we the Images, to mind us of our Duty, still preserving entire the Purity of our Faith. Learn from St. *Jerom*, after what manner they made use of Holy Images in his time; he writes in the Epitaph of *Paula*, That she Adored prostrate on the Ground, before the Cross, as if she saw our Lord hanging on it. And in *Jonas* cap. 4. he proves, That out of the Veneration and Love they had for the Apostles, they generally Painted their Images on the Vessels, which are called *Saucomaries*. And will *Protestants* say, that this was Idolatry?

3. Reg. 11.
Psalm 105.
St. Jo. Damascene.
Adrian I.
Pontif. Ep.
ad Canitar.
& Itiner.
lupp.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Isaiah, cap. 30. ver. 22.	(a) <i>Et contaminabis laminas Sculptilium argenti tui & vesti- mentum Conflatilis auri tui, &c.</i>	And thou shalt contaminate the Plates of the <i>Sculp- tils</i> of thy Silver, and the Garment of the <i>Molten</i> of thy Gold.	(a) Ye shall de- file also the Co- vering of the Gra- ven Images of Sil- ver, and the Or- nament of thy Molten Images of Gold.	In this also they translate <i>Graven</i> and <i>Molten</i> Images, in- stead of <i>Graven</i> and <i>Molten</i> things [or <i>Idols</i> .]
Habbak. cap. 2. ver. 18.	<i>Quid prodest Sulp- tile, quia sculpsit il- lud fictor suus Con- flatile, & Imaginem falsam?</i> יְהִי כִּי יִסְכֵּךְ } גַּלּוּטִין הֵטֵל 1700 } יִגְלֹף־אֶת אֹתוֹ } חֲנֻעִימָא.	What profiteth the thing <i>Engraven</i> , that the forger thereof hath Graven it a Molten, and a false Image?	What profiteth the Image, for the Maker thereof hath made it an Image, and a Teach- er of Lyes?	What profiteth the <i>Graven</i> Image, that the Maker thereof hath Graven it, the Molten Image, and a teacher of Lies?
Daniel, cap. 14. ver. 4.	(b) <i>Quia non cola Idola manufacta,</i> [ἰδωλὰ χειροποίητα.]	Because I worship not <i>Idols</i> made with hands.	(b) I worship not things that be made with hands.	Tho' they have Corrected it, yet the two last Chapters are omitted in their small Impressions for <i>Apocrypha</i> .

(*) **F**Or these two Hebrew words [*Péslim* and *Massechoth*] which are in *Latin*, *Sculptilia* and *Constatilia*, they translate *Images*; neither Word being Hebrew for an *Image*, no more than if one should ask, what is *Latin* for an *Image*? and they should tell him *Sculptile*: Whereupon he seeing a fair Painted Image in a Table, might perhaps say, *Ecce egregium Sculptile*; which, doubtless, every Boy in the *Grammar-School* would laugh at. And this I tell them, because I perceive their endeavour to make *Sculptile* and *Image* all one; which is most evidently false, and to their great shame appears in these Words of *Abasne*, *Quid prodest Sculptile?* &c. which, contrary to the Hebrew and Greek, they translate, *What profiteth the Image?* &c. (as you may see in the former Page).

I wish every common Reader were able to discern their Falshood in this place: First, They make *Sculpere Sculptile* no more than to make an *Image*: which being absurd, as I have hinted, (because the Painter or Embroiderer making an *Image*, cannot be said *Sculpere Sculptile*) might teach them that the Hebrew has in it no signification of *Image*, no more than *Sculpere* can signify to make an *Image*: And therefore the Greek [*συντάξις*] and the *Latin* [*Sculptile*] precisely (for the most part) express neither more nor less than a thing Graven; but yet mean always by these words, a Graven Idol, to which signification they are appropriated by use of Holy Scripture; as are also *Simulacrum*, *Idolum*, *Constatile*, as sometimes *Imago*: In which sense of signifying Idols, if they did repeat *Images* so often, altho' the Translation were not precise; yet were it in some part tolerable, because the Sense were so; but when they do it to bring all Holy Images into contempt, even the Image of our Saviour *Christ* Crucified, they may justly be controuled for false and Heretical Translators. — *Constatile*, here also they falsely translate *Image*, as they did before in *Isaiah*, and as they have done *Sculptile*, tho' two different Words; and, as is said, each signifying another different thing from *Image*. But where they should translate *Image*, as *Imaginem falsam*, a false *Image*, they translate another thing, without any necessary pretence either of Hebrew or Greek, clearly avoiding here the Name of *Image*; because this place tells them, That the Holy Scripture speaketh against False Images; or, as themselves translate, such Images as teach Lyes, representing false Gods, which are not *Idolum nihil est*, (as the Apostle says) and *non sunt Dii, qui manibus fiunt*. Which distinction of False and True Images, our Protestant Translators will not have, because they condemn all Images, even Holy and Sacred also; and therefore make the Holy Scriptures to speak herein, according to their own Fancies. What monstrous and Intollerable Deceit is this?

(b) Wherein they proceed so far, That when *Daniel* said to the King, *I Worship not Idols made with hands*, they make him say, *I Worship not things that be made with hands*; leaving out the word *Idols* altogether; as tho' he had said, nothing made with hands were to be Adored; not the Ark, nor the Propitiatory, no, nor the Holy Cross it self, on which our Saviour shed his precious Blood. As before they added to the Text, so here they diminish and take from it as boldly, as if there had never been a Curse denounced against such Manglers of Holy Scripture.

See you not, that it is not enough for them to corrupt and falsifie the Text, and to add and take away Words and Sentences at their pleasures, but their unparallel'd presumption emboldens them to deprive the People of whole Chapters and Books, as the two last Chapters of *Daniel*, and the rest which they call *Apocrypha*, which are quite left out in their New Bibles. When all this is done, the poor simple People must be glad of this castrated Bible, for their Only Rule of Faith. *Va! Va!*

The reason they give for rejecting them is (as I told you above), That they have formerly been doubted of; but if you demand, why they do not, for the same reason, reject a great many more in the New-Testament? The whole Church of England answers you, in Mr. Rogers's Words, and by him; *How be it we judge them* [viz. Books formerly doubted of in the New-Testament] *Canonical, not so much because Learned and Godly Men in the Church so have, and do receive and allow of them, as for that the Holy Spirit in our Hearts do testifie that they are from GOD.* Roger's Defence of the 39 Articles, pag. 31, 32. So that Protestants are purely beholden to the Private Spirit in the Hearts of their Convocation-Men, for almost half of the New-Testament; which had never been admitted by them in the Canon of Scripture, if the said Private Spirit in their Hearts had not testify'd their being from GOD; no more than the rest call'd *Apocrypha*, which they not only thrust out of the Canon, but omit to publish in their smaller Impressions of the Bible; because, forsooth, the Holy [private] Spirit in their Hearts, testifies them to speak too expressly against their Heretical Doctrines.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Acts Apof. cap. 2. ver. 27.	(a) <i>Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in Inferno.</i> נפשי לא אנטוש אנימה אפיו.	Because thou wilt not leave my <i>Soul</i> in <i>Hell</i> .	(a) Thou shalt not leabe my Car- cass in the Grave. ---Beza. Thou wilt not leabe my Soul in the Grave. (<i>Bib.</i> 1579.)	It is Corrected in this Translation.
Genesis, cap. 37. ver. 35.	(b) <i>Descendam ad filium meum lugens in infernum</i> [נפשי אדמו, <i>Infernus</i> ; for so are the Hebr. Greek, and Latin words for <i>Hell</i> .]	I will go down to my Son into <i>Hell</i> mourning.	(b) I will go down into the Grave unto my Son mourning.	(b) I will go down into the <i>Grave</i> .
Genesis, cap. 42. ver. 38.	<i>Deducetis Canos meos cum dolore ad Inferos.</i>	You will bring down my Gray Hairs with Sorrow unto <i>Hell</i> .	Instead of <i>Hell</i> , they say Grave.	For <i>Hell</i> , they al- so say, <i>Grave</i> .
Genesis, cap. 44. ver. 29, 31.	<i>Deducetis Canos meos cum mærore ad Inferos.</i>	---- With Sorrow unto <i>Hell</i> .	With sorrow unto the Grave.	With sorrow un- to the <i>Grave</i> .
III Reg. cap. 2. ver. 6, 9.	---- <i>Ad Inferos.</i>	---- Unto <i>Hell</i> .	---- To the Grave.	---- To the <i>Grave</i> .

THE Doctrine of our Pretended Reformers, is, *That there was never, from the beginning of the World, any other place for Souls, after this Life, but only Two, to wit, Heaven for the Blessed, and Hell for the Damned.* This Heretical Doctrine includes many Erroneous Branches: *First*, That all the Holy Patriarchs, Prophets, and other Holy Men, of the *Old Testament*, went not into a *Third Place*, called, *Abraham's Bosom*, or *Limbus Patrum*; but immediately to *Heaven*: That they were in *Heaven* before our Blessed Saviour had suffer'd Death for their Redemption, whence it will follow, That our Saviour was not the first Man that Ascended, and entred into *Heaven*. Moreover, by this Doctrine it will follow, That our Saviour *Christ* descended not into any *Third Place* (in our Creed call'd *Hell*) to deliver the Fathers of the *Old Testament*, and to bring them Triumphantly with him into *Heaven*: And so, that Article of the Apostles Creed, concerning our Saviour's *Descent into Hell*, must either be put out, (as indeed it was by *Beza* in the Confession of his Faith, Printed *Anno* 1564.) or it must have some other meaning; to wit, Either the lying of his Body in the Grave; or, (as *Calvin*, and his Followers will have it) The Suffering of Hell-Torments, and Pains upon the Cross.

(a) In defence of these Erroneous Doctrines, they most wilfully corrupt the Holy Scriptures; and especially *Beza*, who in his *New Testament*, Printed by *Roberts Stephanus*, *Anno* 1556. makes our Blessed Saviour *Christ* say thus to his Father, *Non Derelinques Cadaver meum in Sepulchro*; for that which the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*, and *St. Hierom*, according to the *Hebrew* say, *Non derelinques, animam meam in Inferno*. Thus the Prophet *David* spake it in *Hebrew*: Thus the *Septuaginta* uttered it in *Greek*: Thus the Apostle *St. Peter* alledges it: Thus *St. Luke* in the *Acts of the Apostles*: And for this, *St. Augustin* calls him an *Infidel* that denies it. Yet all this would not suffice to make *Beza* translate it so; because, as he says, He would avoid (certain Errors, as he calls them) the Catholick Doctrine of *Limbus Patrum* and *Purgatory*. And therefore, because else it would make for the *Papists* Doctrine, he translates *Animam*, Carcass; *Infernum*, Grave.

And tho' our *English* Translators are asham'd of this foul and absurd Corruption; yet their Intention appears to come not much, if any thing at all, short of *Beza's*; for, in their Bible of 1579. they have it in the Text, *Thou wilt not leave my Soul in the Grave*; and in the Margent, they put, *or Life, or Person*; thereby advertising the Reader, that if it please him, he may read thus, *Thou shalt not leave my Life in the Grave, or, Thou shalt not leave my Person in the Grave*: As tho' either Man's *Soul* or *Life* were in the *Grave*, or *Anima* might be translated *Person*. I said, They were ashamed of *Beza's* Translation; but one would rather think, they purposely design'd to make it worse, if possible. But you see the last Translators have indeed been asham'd of it, and have Corrected it. See you not now, what monstrous and absurd work our first Pretended Reformers made with the Holy Scriptures, on purpose to make it speak for their own turns? By their putting *Grave* in the Text, they design to make it a certain and absolute Conclusion, (howsoever you Interpret *Soul*) that the Holy Scripture, in this place, speaks not of *Christ's* being in *Hell*, but only in the *Grave*; and that according to his *Soul*, *Life*, or *Person*, (or, as *Beza* says, his *Carkass*.) And so his *Soul* in *Hell*, as the Scripture speaks, must be his *Carkass*, *Soul*, or *Life* in the *Grave*, with them. But *St. Chrysostome* says, *He descended to Hell, that the Souls which were there bound, might be loosed.* And as plain are the words of *St. Ireneus*; *During the three days He conversed where the Dead were: As the Prophecy says of him, He remembered his Holy Ones, who were Dead, those who before slept in the Land of Promise; He descended to them, to fetch them out, and save them.*

(b) How absurd also is this Corruption of theirs, *I will go down into the Grave, unto my Son*? as tho' *Jacob* thought that his Son *Joseph* had been Buried in a *Grave*; whereas, a little before, he said, that some *Wild Beast* had Devoured him: But if they mean the state of all Dead Men, by *Grave*, why do they call it *Grave*, and not *Hell*, as the Word is in *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*? But I must demand of our latter Translators, Why they did not Correct this, as they have done the former, seeing the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin* words are the same in both? It cannot be through Ignorance, I find: No! it must have been purely out of a Design, to make their Ignorant Reader believe, that the Patriarch *Jacob* spake of his Body only to descend into the *Grave* to *Joseph's* Body: For as concerning *Jacob's* *Soul*, that (by their Opinion) was to ascend immediately after his Death into *Heaven*, and not to descend into the *Grave*. But if *Jacob* were forthwith to ascend in *Soul*, how could he say, as they translate, *I will go down into the Grave, unto my Son, Mourning*? As if, according to their Opinion, he should say, *My Sons Body is devoured of a Beast, and his Soul is gone up into Heaven: Well, I will go down to him into the Grave.*

Calvin's
Instit. lib.
2. c. 16.
Sect. 10.
Et in his
Catechism.

Psal. 15.
cap. 2.

See Beza's
Annot. in
Act. 2.

St. Chrysf.
in Ezech. 4.
St. Ireneus
Lib. 5. fine.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
Pſalm 85. ver. 13.	(a) <i>Et eruiſti ani- mam meam ex Infer- no inferiori.</i>	Thou haſt deli- vered my Soul from the lower <i>Hell</i> .	(a) Thou haſt de- livered my Soul from the lowest Grave.	Instead of <i>lower Hell</i> , they ſay, <i>lowest Hell</i> .
Pſalm 89. ver. 49.	(b) <i>Eruit animam ſuam de manu Inferi.</i>	Shall he deliver his Soul from the hand of <i>Hell</i> ?	(b) Shall he deli- ver his Soul from the hand of the Grave?	Shall he deliver his Soul from the hand of the <i>Grave</i> ?
Hoſea, cap. 13. ver. 14.	<i>Ero mors tua, O mors, morſus tuus ero Inferne, מוֹרְסָךְ</i>	O Death, I will be thy Death; I will be thy ſting, O <i>Hell</i> .	— O Grave, I will be thy De- ſtruction.	O Death, I will be thy <i>Plagues</i> ; O Grave, I will be thy Deſtru- ction.
1 Corinth. cap. 15. ver. 55.	<i>Ubi eſt mors ſti- mulus tuus? ubi eſt Inferne victoria tua?</i> [אין]	Where is, O Death, thy ſting, where is, O <i>Hell</i> , thy Victory?	O Death, where is thy ſting? O Grave, where is thy Victory?	For <i>Hell</i> , they ſay <i>Grave</i> .
Pſalm 6. ver. 5.	<i>In Inferno autem quis conſitebitur tibi?</i>	But in <i>Hell</i> , who ſhall confeſs to thee?	They ſay, In the <i>Grave</i> .	In the <i>Grave</i> , who ſhall give thee Thanks?
Proverbs, cap. 27. ver. 20.	<i>Infernus & Perdi- tio nunquam imple- tur.</i>	<i>Hell</i> and Deſtru- ction are never full.	The Grave and Deſtruction are never full.	Corrected.
Hebrews, cap. 5. ver. 7.	(c) <i>Qui in diebus Carnis ſuæ preces ſup- plicationeſque ad eum qui poſſit illum ſalvum facere à morte cum clamore valido & Lachrymis offerens exauditus eſt pro ſua Reverentia,</i> [ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας.]	Who in the days of his Fleſh, with a ſtrong Cry and Tears, offering Pray- ers and Supplications to him that could ſave him from Death, was heard for his Reverence.	(c) Which in days of his Fleſh, offer- ed up Prayers, with ſtrong Cry- ing, unto him that was able to ſave him from Death, and was heard, In that which he feared.	Who in the days, &c. And was heard in that he feared.

(a) **U**nderstand, Good Reader, that in the *Old Testament*, none Ascended into *Heaven*, *This way of the Holies* (as the Apostle says) being not yet made open; because our Saviour Christ himself was to Dedicate that New and Living way, and begin the Entrance in his own Person, and by his Passion to open *Heaven*; for none but He was found worthy to open the *Seals*, and to read the *Book*. Therefore (as I said before) the common Phrase of the Holy Scripture, in the *Old Testament*, is even of the best of Men, as well as others, that dying, they went down *ad Inferos*, or, *ad Infernum*; that is, descended not to the *Grave*, which received their Bodies only; but, *ad Inferos*, into *Hell*, a common Receptacle for their Souls.

So we say in our Creed, That our Saviour *CHRIST* himself descended into *Hell*, according to his Soul. So St. Hierom, speaking of the State of the *Old Testament*, says, *If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were in Hell, who was in the Kingdom of Heaven?* And again, *Before the Coming of CHRIST, Abraham was in Hell; after his Coming, the Thief was in Paradise.* And lest it might be objected, that *Lazarus* being in *Abraham's Bosom*, saw the Rich Glutton a far off in *Hell*; and that therefore, both *Abraham* and *Lazarus* seem to have been in *Heaven*: the same Holy Doctor resolves it, That *Abraham* and *Lazarus* also were in *Hell*, but in a place of great Rest and Refreshing; and therefore very far off from the miserable wretched Glutton, that lay in Torments. Which is also agreeable to St. *Augustin's* Interpretation of this place, in the *Psalms*, *Thou hast delivered my Soul from the Lower Hell*; who makes this Sense of it, That the *Lower Hell* is it, wherein the Damned are Tormented, The *Higher Hell* is that, wherein the Souls of the Just rested, calling both Places by the Name of *Hell*. To avoid this distinction of the *Inferior* and *Higher Hell*, our first Translators, instead of *Lower Hell*, rendred it *Lowest Grave*; which they would not for shame have done, had they not been afraid to say in any place of Scripture (how plain soever) that any Soul was deliver'd or return'd from *Hell*; lest it might there follow, that the Patriarchs, and our Saviour *CHRIST* were in such an *Hell*: And tho' the last Translation has restor'd the word *Hell*, in this place; yet so loath were our Translators to hear the Scripture speak of *Limbus Patrum* or *Purgatory*, that they still retain'd the Superlative *Lowest*, lest the Comparative *Lower* (which is the true Translation) might seem more clearly to evince this Distinction between the *Superior* and *Inferior Hell*; tho' they could not at the same time be Ignorant of this Sentence of *Tertullian*; *I know that the Bosom of Abraham was no Heavenly place, but only the Higher Hell; or the higher part of Hell.* Nor can I believe, but that they must have read these Words in St. *Chrysostome*, upon that place of *Esai*. *I will break the Brazen Gates, and bruise the Iron Bars in peeces, and will open the Treasury darkned, &c.* So he (the Prophet) calls *Hell*, says he, *For although it were Hell, yet it held the Holy Souls, and precious Vessels, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.*

(b) And thus all along, where-ever they find the word *Hell*, that is, where it signifies the place in which the Holy Fathers of the *Old Testament* rested, called by the Church [*Limbus Patrum*] they are sure to translate it *Grave*; a Word as much contrary to the signification of the *Greek*, *Hebrew*, or *Latin* words, as *Bread* is to the *Latin* word *Lac*. If I ask them, what is *Hebrew*, *Greek*, or *Latin* for *Hell*, must they not tell me *אֵדֶם* *Adem*, *Infernus*? If I ask them what words they will bring from those Languages to signify *Grave*, must they not say, *קֶבֶר* *Qabar*, *Sepulchrum*? With what Face then can they look upon these willful Corruptions of theirs?

(c) Note here another most damnable Corruption of theirs; Instead of translating (as all Antiquity, with a general and full consent, has ever done in this place) That *CHRIST* was heard of his Father, for his Reverence; they read, *That he was heard in that which he feared*; or, as this last Bible has it, *And was heard in that he feared.* And who taught them this Sense of the Text? doubtless *Beza*; who, for the most part they follow; and he had it from *Calvin*, who, he says, was the first that ever found out this Interpretation. — And why Invented *Calvin* this, but to defend his Blasphemous Doctrine, That our Saviour *Iesus CHRIST* upon the Cross, was horribly afraid of Damnation: And that he was in the very Sorrows and Torments of the Damned: And that this was his descending into *Hell*: And that otherwise he descended not. Note this, good Reader, and then judge to what wicked end this Translation tends. Who-ever heard of greater Blasphemy; and yet they dare presume to force the Scripture, by their false Translation, to back them in it; *He was heard in that which he feared*: as if they should say, He was delivered from Damnation, and the Eternal pains of *Hell*, of which he was sore afraid. What dare they not do, who tremble not at this?

Heb. 9. ver. 8.
Heb. 10. ver. 20.

Epist. Nepot. cap. 3.

St. Aug. in Psal. 85. ver. 13.

Tertul. lib. 4. adversus Marcion. S. Chrysost. Hom. quod Christus sit Deus, To. 5.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Romans, cap. 2. ver. 26.	(a) <i>Si igitur præputiū Justitias [δικαιοματων] legis custodiat, &c.</i>	If then the Pre- puce keep the Justices of the Law, &c.	(a) If the Uncircum- cision keep the Or- dinances of the Law.	If therefore the Uncircumcision keep the Righteousness of the Law.
St. Luke, cap. 1. ver. 6.	<i>Erant autem Iusti [δικοι] ambo ante Deum incedentes in omnibus mandatis & Justificationibus [και δικαιοματων] Domini sine querela.</i>	And they were both Just before God, walking in all the Commandments and Justifications of our Lord, without blame.	And they were both Righteous be- fore God, walking in all the Com- mandments and Ordinances of the Lord, blameless.	And they were both Righteous be- for God, walking in all the Command- ments and Ordinan- ces of the Lord, blameless.
Apocalips, cap. 19. ver. 8.	(b) <i>Byssinum enim Ju- stificationes sunt San- ctorum. [τα δικαιοματα.]</i>	For the Silk are the Justifications of Saints.	(b) For the fine Lin- nen are the Righte- ousness of Saints.	For the fine Lin- nen is the Righteous- ness of Saints.
2 Timoth. cap. 4. ver. 8.	(c) <i>In reliquo, reposita est mihi Corona Ju- stitiæ, [της δικαιοσυνης,] quam reddet mihi Do- minus in illa die Justus Judex [ὁ δικαιος κριτης αυτου], &c.</i>	Concerning the rest, there is laid up for me a Crown of Justice, which our Lord will render to me in that day a Just Judge.	(c) Henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown of righteousness, which the Lord the Right- eous Judge shall give me, &c.	For Justice, they translate Righteous- ness: And for a Just Judge, they say a Righteous Judge.
II Thessalo. cap. 1. ver. 5, 6.	— In Exemplum Iusti [δικαιου] Judicii Dei, ut digni habea- mini in regno Dei, pro quo & patiamini si tamen Justum est, [δικαιον ̄στι.] apud De- um retribuere tribula- tionem iis qui vos tri- bulant.	For an Example of the Just Judgment of God, that you may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God for which you suffer, that yet it be Just with God to re- pay Tribulation to them that Vex you, and to you that are vexed, rest with us, &c.	Rejoyce, &c. — Which is a token of the Righteous Judgment of God, that you may be counted worthy of the Kingdome of God, for which ye suffer. For it is a Righteous thing with God, to re- compence Tribu- lation to them that trouble you, and to you that are troubled rest.	Here also they say Righteous Judgment, and Righteous thing, instead of Just, &c.
Hebrews, cap. 6. ver. 10.	<i>Non enim Injustus [αδικοσ] Deus, ut obli- viscatur operis vestri, &c.</i>	For God is not Unjust, that he should forget your Works, &c.	God is not Un- righteous, to forget your good works and labour.	For God is not Unrighteous, &c.

(a) AS the Article of *Justification* has many branches, and as their Errors therein are manifold; so are their *English* Translations accordingly many ways False and Heretical: First, Against *Justification* by *Good-Works*, and by keeping the Commandments, they suppress the very Name of *Justification* in all such places where the word signifies the Commandments, or the *Law* of *GOD*; and where the *Greek* signifies most exactly *Justices* and *Justifications*, according as our *Vulgar Latin* translates, *Justitias* & *Justificationes*, there the *English* Translations say, *Statutes* or *Ordinances*; as you see in these Examples, where their last Translation (because they would seem to be doing, tho' to small purpose) changes the first Corruption [*Ordinances* of the *Law*] into *Righteousness*; another word, as far from what it should have been (in comparison) as the first: And to what end is all this, but to avoid the term *Justifications*? they cannot be Ignorant how different this is from the *Greek*, which they pretend to translate. — In the *Old-Testament*, perhaps they will pretend that they follow the *Hebrew* word, which is [קִיּוּם]; and therefore they translate *Statutes* and *Ordinances* [*Righteousness* too, if they please]; but even there also, are not the *Seventy Greek Interpreters* sufficient to teach them the signification of the *Hebrew* word, who always interpret it, *δικαιοσύνη*; in *English*, *Justifications*?

But admit that they may controul the *Septuagint* in the *Hebrew*; yet in the *New-Testament* they do not pretend to translate the *Hebrew*, but rather the *Greek*; What reason have they then for rejecting the word *Just* and *Justifications*? surely, no other reason, but that which their Master *Beza* gives for the same thing; saying, That he rejected the word *Justificationes*, on purpose to avoid the Cavils that might be made from this word, against *Justification* by *Faith*: As if he should say, This Word, truly translated according to the *Greek*, might minister great occasion to prove, by so many places of Scripture, that Man's *Justification* is not by *Faith* only, but also by keeping the *Law*, and observing the Commandments of *GOD*; which, therefore, are call'd according to the *Greek* and *Latin*, *Justificationes*, because they concur to *Justification*, and the making a Man *Just*: As by *St. Luke's* words, also, is well signified; which have this Allusion, that they were both *Just*, because they walk'd in all the *Justifications* of our Lord; which they design'dly suppress by other words.

Beza in Annotation in 1 Luk.

(b) And hereof also it rises, that when *Beza* could not possibly avoid the word in his Translation, (*Apoc. 19. 8. The Silk is the Justifications of Saints*) he helps the matter with this Commentary, That *Justifications* are those *Good Works*, which are the Testimony of a lively *Faith*. But our *English* Translators have found another way to avoid the word, even in their Translations: For they (because they could not say *Ordinances*) translate, *The Righteousness of Saints*; Abhorring the word *Justifications of Saints*, because they know full-well, that this word includes the *Good-works* of *Saints*; which Works, if they should in translating, call their *Justifications*, it would rise up against their *Justification* by *Faith* only: Therefore, where they cannot translate *Ordinances* and *Statutes*, which are terms farthest off from *Justification*, they say, *Righteousness*, making it also the Plural Number; whereas the more proper *Greek* word for *Righteousness*, is *εὐνομία* (*Dan. 6. 22.*) which there some of them translate *Obedience*, because they will not translate exactly if you would hire them.

Beza Annotation in Apoc. 19.

And by their translating *Righteous*, instead of *Just*, they bring it, that *Joseph* was a *Righteous* Man, rather than a *Just* Man; and *Zachary* and *Elizabeth* were both *Righteous* before *GOD*, rather than *Just*; because when a Man is called *Just*, it sounds, that he is so indeed, and not by *Imputation* only. Note also, That where *Faith* is joyn'd with the word *Just*, they omit not for to translate it *Just*, [*The Just shall live by Faith*] to signify that *Justification* is by *Faith* alone.

Rom. 1.

(c) These places (*2 Tim. 2 Thessal. & Heb.*) do very fairly discover their False and Corrupt Intentions, in concealing the word *Justice* in all their Bibles; for, if they should translate truly, as they ought to do, it would Infer, That Men are *justly* Crown'd in *Heaven* for their *Good Works* upon *Earth*; and that it is *GOD's Justice* so to do; and that He will do so, because He is a *just Judge*; and because he will shew his *just Judgment*; and He will not forget so to do, because He is not *Unjust*; as the Ancient Fathers do Interpret and Expound. *St. Augustin* most excellently declares, That it is *GOD's* Grace, Favour, and Mercy in making us, by his Grace, to Live and Believe well, and so to be worthy of *Heaven*; and his *Justice* and *just Judgment*, to render and repay *Eternal Life* for those Works which Himself wrought in us: which he thus expresses, *How should he render or repay as a just Judge, unless He had given it as a Merciful Father?*

St. Chrys. Theodoret, Occumen. upon these places. St. Aug. de Gra. & lib. Arbitr. cap. 6.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles Printed An. Dom 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Romans, cap. 8. ver. 18.	(a) Existimo [λογίζομαι] enim quod non sunt condignæ passiones hujus tempo- ris ad futuram Glori- am, &c. [ἐκ αἰτίας περὶ τῶν μέλλοντων δόξαν.]	For <i>I think</i> that the Passions of this time are not <i>Condign</i> to the Glory to come, that shall be revealed in us.	(a) For <i>I</i> am certainly perswaded, that the afflictions of this time, are not <i>Worthy</i> of the Glory which shall be in us.	For <i>I reckon</i> , that the Sufferings of this present time, are not <i>Worthy</i> to be com- pared with the Glory which shall be re- vealed in us.
Hebrews, cap. 10. ver. 29.	(b) Quanto magis putatis deteriora me- reri supplicia, [πιστεύοντες ἀξιοῦσθαι τιμωρίας,] qui Filium Dei conculcaverit, &c.	How much more, think you, doth he <i>deserve worse punish-</i> <i>ments</i> , who hath trodden the Son of God under-foot?	(b) How much soer shall he be punished , which treadeth under- foot the Son of God?	Of how much so- rer punishment, sup- pose ye, shall he be thought <i>Worthy</i> , who hath trodden under- foot the Son of God?
Colloſſians cap. 1. ver. 12.	(c) Gratias agen- tes Deo Patri qui Dignos, [ἀξιοῦσάντων] nos fecit in partem, sortis Sanctorum in lumine.	Giving thanks to God the Father, who hath made us wor- thy unto the part of the Lot of the Saints in the Light.	(c) Giving thanks to God the Father, that hath made us Meet to be partakers of the Inheritance of the Saints in Light.	Giving thanks un- to the Father, that hath made us <i>Meet</i> , &c.
Pſalm 118. ver. 112.	(d) Inclinaui cor meum ad faciendas Justificationes tuas in Eternum propter Re- tributionem.	I have <i>inclined</i> my heart to do thy <i>Justi-</i> <i>fications</i> for ever for <i>Reward</i> .	(d) I have ap- plied my heart to fulfil thy Statutes always, even unto the end.	--- <i>Even unto the end.</i>
Hebrews, cap. 2. ver. 9.	(e) Eum autem qui modico quam An- geli minoratus est, vi- demus Jesum propter passionem mortis gloria & honore coronatum.	But him that was a little lessened under the Angels, we see Jesus, because of the Passion of Death, Crowned with Glory and Honour.	(e) We see Jesus Crowned with Glory and Honor, which was a little inferior to the An- gels, thro' the suf- fering of Death.	But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the Angels, for the suf- fering of Death, Crowned with Glory and Honour.

(a) Shall not say much of this gross Corruption, because they have been pleas'd to Correct it in their last Translation: Nor will I stand upon their first words [*I am certainly perswaded*] which is a far greater Affelevation, than the Apostle uses; I wonder how they could thus translate that Greek word, ἀξιοῦμαι; but that they were resolv'd not only to translate the Apostles words falsly, against *Meritorious Works*, but also to avouch and affirm the same lustily. And for the words following, they are not in Greek, as they translate in their first Eng. Bibles, [*The Afflictions are not worthy of the Glory*,] &c. (because they will not have our Suffering here, tho' for CHRIST's sake, to Merit Eternal Glory;) but thus, *The afflictions of this time, are not equal, correspondent, or comparable to the Glory to come*, because they are short; but the Glory is Eternal, the Afflictions are small and few, in comparison; the Glory great and abundant, above measure. By this the Apostle would encourage us to Suffer, as he does also in another place, very plainly, when he says, *Our Tribulation, which presently is for a moment and light, Worketh [Prepareth, says their Bible, 1577. with a very false Meaning] above Measure exceedingly, an Eternal weight of Glory in us*: See you not here, that short Tribulation in this Life Works, that is, Causes, Purchases, and Deserves an Eternal weight of Glory in the next? And what is that, but to be Meritorious, and worthy of the same? as St. Cyprian says, *O what manner of day shall come, my Brethren, when our Lord shall recount the Merits of every one, and pay us the Reward, or stipend of Faith and Devotion? Here you see are Merits, and the Reward for the same*.—Likewise St. Augustin; *The exceeding goodness of God has provided this, that the Labours should soon be ended, but the Rewards of the Merits shall endure without end; the Apostle testifying, the Passions of this time are not comparable, &c. For we shall receive greater Blifs, than are the Afflictions of all Passions whatsoever*.

St. Cyprian
Ep. 56. n. 3
St. August.
Serm. 57.
de Sanct.

(b) How deceitfully they deal with the Scripture in this place? One of their Bibles very falsly and corruptly leaving out the words, [*Worthy of, or Deserve*] saying, *How much sorer shall he be Punished, &c?* And the last of their Translations, adding as falsly to the Text, the word [*Thought*] *How much sorer Punishment shall he be thought worthy of, &c?* And this is done to avoid this consequence, which must have follow'd, by translating the Greek word sincerely; to wit, If the Greek here, by their own Translation, signifie to be *Worthy of*, or to *Deserve*, being spoken of Pains or Punishments deserved; then must they grant us the same word to signifie the same thing, else, where in the *New Testament*, when it is spoken of deserving *Heaven*, and the Kingdom of *GOD*, as in *Luk. cap. 20*, and *21*. where, if they translate according to the Greek, which they pretend to, they should say, *May be Worthy*, and, *They that are Worthy*; and not according to the Vulgar *Latin*, which, I see, they are willing to follow, when they think it may make the more for their turn.

Bible of
1561.

(c) The Greek word *ἀξιοῦμαι*, they translate to make *Meet* in this place; but in other places (*viz. Mat. 3. c. 8. 11 & v. 8.*) they translate, *ἀξίως, Worthy*. And why could they not follow the Old *Latin* Interpreter one step further? seeing this was the place where they should have shew'd their Sincerity, and have said, *That God makes us Worthy of Heavenly Blifs*; because they cannot but know, that if *ἀξίως* be *Worthy*, then *ἀξιοῦμαι* must needs be, to make *Worthy*. But they follow their Old Master *Beza*, who tells them, *That here, and here, and so forth, I have follow'd the Old Latin Interpreter, translating it Worthy*; but in such and such a place (meaning this for one) I chuse rather to say *Meet*: What presumption is here? The Greek Fathers Interpret it *Worthy*. St. Chrysostome, upon this place, says, *God doth not only give us Society with the Saints, but makes us also Worthy to receive so great a Dignity*. And Occumenius says, *That it is God's Glory to make his Servants Worthy of such good things: And that it is their glory to be made Worthy of such things*.

Beza Anno-
tat. in 3.
Math. No.
Test. 1556.
Occum. in
Caten.
St. Basil in
Orat. Litu

(d) Here is yet another most notorious Corruption against *Merits*; *I have applied my Heart to fulfil thy Statutes, always, even unto the End*; and for their Evasion here, they fly to the Ambiguity of the Hebrew Word, [עָשִׂיתִי] as if the Seventy Interpreters were not sufficient to determine the same; but because they find it ambiguous, they are resolv'd to take their liberty, tho' contrary to St. Hierom, and the Ancient Fathers, both Greek and Latin.

(e) In fine, So obstinately are they set against *Merits*, and *Meritorious Works*, that some of them think, that even *Christ* himself did not *Merit* his own Glory and Exaltation: For making out of which Error, I suppose, they have transpos'd the words of this Text, thereby making the Apostle say, *That Christ was made Inferiour to Angels by his suffering Death*; that is, says *Beza*, *For to suffer Death*; by which they quite exclude the true Sense, [*That for suffering Death, he was Crown'd with Glory*]; which are the true words and meaning of the Apostle. But in their last Translations, they so place the words, that they will have it left so ambiguous, that you may follow whether sense you will: Intolerable is their Deceit!

See Calvin
in Epistol.
Philip.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
St. John, cap. 1. ver. 12.	(a) <i>Quotquot au- tem receperunt eum, dedit eis potestatem ἐξουσίαν. filios Dei fieri.</i>	But as many as received him, he gave them power to be made the Sons of God.	(a) But as ma- ny as received him, he gave them Prerogative, [Dignity saith Beza] to be the Sons of God.	Corrected.
1 Corinth. cap. 15. ver. 10.	(b) --- <i>Sed abun- dantiùs illis omnibus laboravi: non ego au- tem sed Gratia Dei mecum. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί.</i>	--- But I have la- boured more abun- dantly than all they; yet not I, but the Grace of God with me.	(b) --- yet not I, but the Grace of God which is with me.	--- Yet not I, but the Grace of God which was with me.
Ephesians, cap. 3. ver. 12.	(c) <i>In quo habe- mus fiduciam & ac- cessum in confidentia per fidem ejus.</i>	In whom we have affiance and access in confidence, by the Faith of him.	(c) By whom we have boldness and entrance, with the confidence wh ^{ch} is by the Faith of him, (or in him, as Beza has it.)	Corrected.
2 Corinth. cap. 6. ver. 1.	(d) <i>Adjuvantes [ἐννεργουῦντες] autem exhortamur, ne in va- cuum gratiam Dei re- cipiatis.</i>	And we helping, do Exhort, that you receive not the Grace of God in vain.	(d) And we Gods Labourers, &c. In another Bible, we together are Gods Labourers.	Corrected.
Romans, cap. 5. ver. 6.	(e) <i>Ut quid enim Christus, cum adhuc infirmi essemus, [ὅντων ἡμῶν ἀδυνάτων] secundum tempus pro Impiis mortuus est.</i>	For, why did Christ, when we as yet were weak, accord- ing to the time, Die for the Impious.	(e) Christ, when we were yet of no strength, died for the ungodly.	For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.
1 Ep. John, cap. 5. ver. 3.	(f) <i>Hæc est e- nim Charitas Dei, ut mandata ejus custodi- amus: & Mandata e- jus gravia non sunt, [αἱ ἐντολὰὶ βαρεῖς οὐκ εἰσίν.]</i>	For this is the Charity of God, that we keep his Com- mandments: And his Commandments are not heavy.	(f) --- And his Commandments are not Grievous.	--- Instead of, <i>His Commandments are not heavy</i> , they say, <i>Are not Grievous.</i>
St. Matth. cap. 19. ver. 11.	(g) <i>Qui dixit il- lis non omnes ca- puit [εἰ πάντες χωρεῖν] verbum istud, sed qui- bus datum est.</i>	--- All men do not receive this saying.	(g) --- All men cannot receive this saying.	--- All men can- not receive this say- ing.

(a) **A**gainst *Free-Will*, instead of *Power*, They translate, *Prerogative*; and *Beza*, *Dignity*; protesting, That whereas in other places, he often translated this *Greek Word*, *Power* and *Authority*, here he refused both indeed against *Free-Will*; which, he says, the *Sophists* would prove out of this place, reprehending *Erasmus* for following them in his Translation.—But whereas the *Greek Word* is indifferent to signify *Dignity* or *Liberty*; he that will translate either of these, and exclude the other, restrains the Sense of the *Holy Ghost*, and determines it to his own Fancy. Now may we as well translate *Liberty*, as *Beza* does *Dignity*? but we must not abridge the Sense of the *Holy Ghost* to one particular meaning; and therefore we translate *Potestas* and *Power*, words indifferent to signify both *Dignity* and *Liberty*: But in their last Bible it is Corrected. It had been well, if they had Corrected this next, tho' I think, of the two, they have made it worse; translating, *Not I, but the Grace of GOD which was with me* (*Which is with me*, say their Old Bibles.)

(b) By which Falsity, they here also restrain the Sense of the *Holy Ghost*; whereas, if they had translated according to Sincerity, --- *Yet not I, but the Grace of God with me*, the Text might have had not only the Sense they confine it to, but also this, *Not I, but the Grace of God which laboured with me*. So that, by this latter, it may be evidently signify'd, That the Grace of God, and the Apostle, both laboured together; and not only *Grace*, as if the Apostle had done nothing, like unto a Block, or forced only; but that the *Grace of God* did so concur, as the Principal Agent, with all his Labours that his *Free-Will* wrought with it: And this is the most approved Interpretation of this place which their Translation, (by putting, *which is*, or, *which was* into the Text) excludes.

But they reprehend the Vulgar *Latin* Interpreter for neglecting the *Greek Article*, not considering that the same many times cannot be express'd in *Latin*; the *Greek Phrase* having this *Prerogative* above the *Latin*, to speak more briefly, commodiously, and significantly by the Article, as *Jacobus Zebedai*, *Jacobus Alphai*, *Judas Jacobi*, *Maria Cleophae*; in all which, tho' the *Greek Article* is not express'd, yet they are all sincerely translated into *Latin*. Nor can the Article be express'd without adding more than the Article, and so not without adding to the Text, as they do very boldly in such Speeches, throughout the *New-Testament*? Yea, they do it when there is no Article in the *Greek*, and that purposely: As in this of the *Ephesians* (c) where they say, *Confidence*, is by Faith, as tho' there were no Confidence by Works. The *Greek*, *ἐκ τῆς πίστεως διὰ τῶν ἔργων* bears not that Translation, unless there were an Article after *Confidence*, which is not; but they add it to the Text: As also *Beza* does the like (*Rom. 8. 2.*), and their *Geneva English Testaments* after him, for to maintain the Heresie of *Imputative Justice*: As in his Annotations he plainly deduces, saying confidently, *I doubt not, but a Greek Article must be understood*; and therefore, forsooth, put into the Text also. He does the same in *St. James 2. ver. 20.* still debating the case in his Annotations, why he does so; and when he has concluded in his Fancy, that this or that is the Sense, he puts it so in the Text, and translates accordingly. But if they say, That in this place (c) of the *Corinthians*, there is a *Greek Article*, and therefore they do well to express it. I Answer, First, The Article may then be express'd in Translation, when there can be but one Sense of the same. Secondly, It must be express'd, when we cannot otherwise give the Sense of the place; as *Mat. 1. 6.* *ἐκ τῆς οὐρίας*, *Ex ea que fuit Uria*, where the Vulgar Interpreter omits it not; but in this of *St. Paul*, which we now speak of, where the Sense is doubtful; and the *Latin* expresses the *Greek* sufficiently otherwise, he leaves it also doubtful and indifferent, not abridging it, as they do, saying, *The Grace of GOD which is with me*.

(d) Again, In this other place of the *Corinthians*, where the Apostle calls himself and his Fellow Preachers *GOD's Co-adjutors*, *Co-labourers*, or such as labour and work with God, how falsely have their first Translators made it, let themselves, who have Corrected it in their last Bible, judge.

(e) And in this next, the Apostles words do not signify, that *We had no strength*, or, *were without strength*; but that we were *Weak*, *Feeble*, *Infirm*: And this they corrupt to defend their False Doctrine, *That Free-will was altogether lost by Adam's Sin*.

(f) When they have bereav'd and spoil'd a Man of his *Free-Will*, and left him without all strength, they go so far in this point, that they say, The Regenerate themselves have not *Free-Will* and *Ability*; no, not by and with the Grace of God, to keep the Commandments. To this purpose, they translate, His Commandments are not *Grievous*, rather than *Are not heavy*; for in saying, *They are not heavy*, it would follow they might be kept and observed; but in saying, *They are not Grievous*, that may be true, were they never so heavy or impossible, through Patience; as when a Man cannot do as he would; yet it grieves him not, being Patient and Wise, because he is content to do as he can, and is able.

(g) Our Saviour says not, in this place of *St. Matth.* as they falsely translate, *All Men cannot*, but, *All Men don't*; and therefore, *St. Augustine* says, *Because all will not*: But when our Saviour says afterwards, *He that can receive, let him receive*: He adds another *Greek word* to express that Sense, *ὁ δυνάμενος χωρὶς χωρῖς*; whereas by the Protestant fond Translation, he might have said, *ὁ χωρὶς χωρῖς*. Vid. above.

Beza No. Test. 1580.

Whitaker p. 18.

Beza in Annotation. Rom. 2. 27.

St. August. de gra. & lib. Arbitr. cap. 4.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
Romans, cap. 5. ver. 18.	(a) <i>Igitur sicut per unius delictum in om- nes homines in Con- demnationem: sic & per unius Justitiam in omnes homines in Ju- stificationem vitæ.</i>	Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to Con- demnation: So also, by the Justice of one, unto all men to Ju- stification of Life.	(a) Likewise then as by the offence of one, the fault came on all Men to Condemnation: So by the Justify- ing of one, the be- nefit abounded to- wards all men, to the Justification of Life.	Therefore, as by the offences of one, Judgment came upon all men to Condem- nation: Even so by the Righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all Men unto Justification of Life.
Romans, cap. 4. ver. 3.	(b) <i>Credidit Abra- ham Deo & reputatum est illi ad Justitiam.</i> [εἰς δικαιοσύνην.]	Abraham believed God, and it was re- puted him to Justice.	(b) Abraham Be- lieved God, and it was reputed to him for Justice.	And it was ac- counted unto him for Righteousness.
2 Corinth. cap. 5. ver. ult.	(c) <i>— Ut nos effice- remur Justitia Dei in ipso. [δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.]</i>	— That we might be made the Justice of God in him.	(c) That we by his means should be that Righteous- ness, which before God is allowed.	That we might be made the Righteous- ness of God in him.
Ephesians, cap. 1. ver. 6.	(d) <i>In qua gratifi- cavit [χαρίτωσιν] nos in dilecto filio suo.</i>	Wherein he hath gratified us in his be- loved Son.	(d) Wherein he bath made us ac- cepted, [or, freely accepted] in his Beloved Son.	Wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved.
Daniel, cap. 6. ver. 22.	(e) <i>— Quia co- ram eo Justitia inven- ta est in me.</i>	— Because before him, Justice was found in me.	(e) Because be- fore him, my Ju- stice was found out.	For as much as before him Innocency was found in me.
Romans, cap. 4. ver. 6.	(f) <i>Sicut & David dicit [λαλει] beatitu- dinem hominis cui De- us accepto fert Justi- tiam sine operibus.</i>	As David also termeth the blessed- ness of a Man, to whom God reputeth Justice with ^{out} Works	(f) As David describeth the Bles- sedness of the Man unto whom God imputeth Righte- ousness.	Instead of <i>Termeth</i> , they say, <i>Describeth</i> ; and for <i>Justice</i> , they have <i>Righteousness</i> .

(a) **B**EZA, in his Annotations on Rom. 5. 18. protests, That his adding to this Text is especially against *Inherent Justice*, which, he says, is to be avoided as nothing more. His false Translation you see our *English Bibles* follow; and have added no fewer than six words in this one Verse; Yea, their last Translations have added Seven; and some of these words much different from those of their former Brethren; so that it is impossible to make them agree betwixt themselves: I cannot but admire to see how loth they are to suffer the Holy Scripture to speak in behalf of *Inherent Justice*.

(b) So also in this next place, where they add the word *For* to the Text, *And it was reputed to be him for Justice*, (*For Righteousness*, says their last Righteous work, for the longer they live the further they are divided from *Justice*) because they would have it to be nothing else, but instead and place of *Justice*; thereby taking away true *Inherent Justice*, even in *Abraham* himself. But admit this Translation of theirs (which, notwithstanding in their Sense, is False), must it needs signifie not true *Inherent Justice*, because the Scripture says, it was reputed for *Justice*? Do such Speeches import, That it is not so indeed, but is only reputed so? Then if we should say, This shall be reputed to thee for Sin, for a great benefit, &c. it should signifie it is no Sin indeed, nor great Benefit. But let them remember, that the Scripture uses to speak of Sin, and of Justice alike, *Reputabitur tibi in peccatum, It shall be reputed to thee for Sin*, as St. Hieron translates it. If then Justice only be reputed, Sin also is only reputed: If Sin be in us indeed, Justice is in us indeed. And the Greek Fathers make it plain, *That to be reputed unto Justice*, is to be true Justice indeed; Interpreting St. Paul's words, *That Abraham obtained Justice*, *Abraham was justify'd*; for that is, say they, *It was reputed him to Justice*. And St. James, testifies, that, *In that Abraham was justified by Faith and Works, the Scripture was fulfilled*; that says, *It was reputed him to Justice*, Gen. 15. ver. 6. in which words of Genesis, there is not, *For Justice*, or, *instead of Justice*, as the *English Bibles* have it; for the Hebrew *וְיִצְחָק לֹא צָדִיק* should not be so translated, especially when they mean it was so counted or reputed for *Justice*, that it was not *Justice* indeed.

Deus. c. 23.
& 24.
Occur in
Caten. Phos-
tius.
Cap. 2. ver.
23.

(c) Again, How intolerably have their first Translations corrupted St. Paul's words (2 Cor. 5.) which, tho' their latter Bibles have undertaken to Correct, yet would not their Herefie suffer them to amend also the word *Righteousness*? It is Death to them to hear of *Justice*.

(d) Here again, they make St. Paul say, That GOD made us accepted, or, freely accepted in his beloved Son, (their last Translation leaves out *Son* very boldly, changing the word *His* into *The*, *Accepted in the Beloved*) as if they had a mind to say, that *In* (or *among*) all the Beloved in the World, God has only accepted us: as they make the Angel in St. Luke say to our Blessed Lady, *Hail, freely Beloved*, to take away all Grace inherent and resident in the B. Virgin, or in us: Whereas the Apostles word signifies that we are truly made *Grateful*, or, *Gracious* and *Acceptable*; that is to say, That our Soul is inwardly Endu'd and Beautify'd with Grace, and the Vertues proceeding from it; and consequently, is Holy indeed, before the sight of GOD, and not only so accepted or reputed as they imagine. Which St. Chrysostome sufficiently testifies in these words; *He said not, which he freely gave us, but, wherein he made us Grateful; that is, not only delivered us from Sins, but also made us Beloved and Amiable, made our Soul Beautiful and Grateful; such as the Angels and Arch-Angels desire to see, and such as himself is in Love withal, according to that in the Psalm, The King shall desire, or be in love with thy Beauty.* St. Hieron speaking of Baptism, says, *Now thou art made clean in the Laver: And of thee 'tis said, Who is she that ascends white? and let her be washed, yet she cannot keep her Purity, unless she be strengthened from our Lord: whence is plain, That by Baptism, original Sin being expell'd, Inherent Justice takes place in the Soul, rendring it Clean, White, and Pure; which Purity the Soul, strengthened by GOD's Grace, may keep and conserve.*

St. Chryf.
in this place
of the Ephe-
sians.

St. Hieron.
lib. 3. comar.
Pelagianos.

(e) Another Falsification they make here in *Daniel*, translating, *My justice was found out*; and in another Bible, *My Unguiltiness was found out*, to draw it from *Inherent Justice*, which was in *Daniel*. In their last Edition, you see they are resolv'd to Correct their Brethren's Fault; notwithstanding, tho' they mend one, yet they make another; putting *Innocency* instead of *Justice*: 'Tis very strange, that our *English Protestant Divines* should have such a peek against *Justice*, that they cannot endure to see it stand in the Text, where both the *Chaldee, Greek and Latin* place it.

(f) It must needs be a spot of the same Infection, that they translate *Describeth* here; as tho' Imputed *Righteousness*, (for so they had rather say, than *Justice*) were the Description of *Blessedness*.

<i>The Book, Chapter, and Verse.</i>	<i>The Vulgar Latin Text.</i>	<i>The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.</i>	<i>Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.</i>	<i>The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.</i>
Hebrews, cap. 10. ver. 22.	(a) <i>Accedamus cum vero corde in pleni- tudine Fidei</i> [ἐν πλη- ροφεια πίστεως.]	Let us approach with a true Heart, in <i>fulness</i> of Faith.	(a) Let us draw nigh with a true heart, in assurance of Faith.	Let us draw near with a true Heart, in <i>full assurance</i> of Faith.
1 Corinth. cap. 13. ver. 2.	(b) <i>Et si habuero om- nem</i> [πᾶσαν] <i>Fidem,</i> <i>ita ut montes transfe- ram Charitatem au- tem non habuero, nihil sum.</i>	And if I should have <i>all</i> Faith, so that I could remove Mountains, and have not Charity, I am nothing.	(b) If I should have whole Faith. [<i>Totam Fidem</i> , faith Beza, for, <i>Omnem Fi- dem</i> .]	<i>All</i> Faith.
1 Corinth. cap. 12. ver. 31.]	<i>Et ad huc excel- lentiorẽ viam vobis demonstro.</i>	And yet I shew you a <i>more excellent</i> way.	Beza in Testament 1556. translates it, Behold, moreover also I shew you a way most dili- gently. And in another, <i>viz.</i> of 1565. And besides I shew you a way to Excellen- cy.	Corrected.
St. James, cap. 2. ver. 22.	(c) <i>Vides quoniam Fides co-operabatur</i> <i>συνήργησεν</i> <i>operibus illius.</i>	Seest thou that Faith <i>did work</i> with his Works.	(c) Thou seest that Faith was a helper of his works. Beza.	Corrected.
St. Luke, cap. 18. ver. 42.	(d) <i>Et Jesus dixit illi: respice, Fides tua te Salvum fecit</i> [ἡ πίστις σὺ σῶσινέ σε.]	Thy Faith hath <i>made thee whole.</i>	(d) Thy Faith hath saved thee.	Thy Faith hath <i>saved thee.</i>
St. Mark, cap. 10. ver. 52. and cap. 8. ver. 48.	<i>Vade. Fides tua te salvum fecit.</i>	Thy Faith hath <i>made thee safe.</i>	Thy Faith hath saved thee.	Corrected.

ALL other means of Salvation being thus taken away, as you have already seen, their only and last Refuge is *ONLY FAITH*; and the same not the Christian Faith of the Articles of the Creed, and such like; but a special Faith and Confidence, whereby every Man must assuredly Believe, that Himself is the Son of God; and one of the Elect and Predestinate to Salvation. If he be not, by *Faith*, as sure of this, as of *Christ's* Incarnation and Death, he shall never be Saved.

(a) For the maintaining of this Heresie, they force the *Greek* to express the very word of *Assurance* and *Certainty*, thus; *Let us draw nigh with a true Heart, in Assurance of Faith*: Their last Translation makes it, *In full Assurance of Faith*: adding the word *full* to what it was before; and that, either because they would be thought to draw that word from the Original, or else because they would thereby signifie such an *Assurance* or *Certainty*, as should be beyond all manner of doubt or fear; thereby excluding not only *Charity*, but even *Hope* also, as unnecessary.

The *Greek* is far different from their Expression; for it signifies, properly, the Fulness and Complement of any thing; and therefore the Apostle joyns it sometimes with *Faith*, sometimes with *Hope*, (as in *Heb. 6. ver. 11.*) sometimes with *Knowledge* or *Understanding*, (*Col. 2. ver. 2.*) to signifie the Fulness of all Three, as the Vulgar *Latin* Interpreter most sincerely (*Rom. 4. ver. 21.*) translates it. Thus when the *Greek* signifies *Fulness of Faith*, rather than *Full Assurance* (or as *Beza* has it, *Certain Perswasion*) of *Faith*, they err in the precise Translation of it; and much more do they err in the Sense, when they apply it to the *Certain* and *Assured Faith* that every Man ought to have (as they say) of his own Salvation. Whereas the *Greek Fathers* Expound it of the *Fulness of Faith*, that every Faithful Man must have of all such things in Heaven, as he sees not; namely, That *CHRIST* is Accepted thither, That He shall come with Glory to judge the World, &c. Adding further, and proving out of the Apostles words next following, That (the Protestants) *only Faith is not sufficient, be it never so special or assured*.—For the said reason do they also translate, *The special Gift of Faith*, (*Sap. 3. 14.*) instead of, *The chosen gift of Faith*. Another gross Corruption have they in *Ecclesiasticus*, *cap. 5. ver. 5.* But because, in their Bibles of the latter Stamp, they have rejected these Books, as not Canonical (tho' they can shew us no more Reason or Authority for their so doing, than for Altering and Corrupting the Text) I shall be content to pass it by.

(b) *Beza*, by Corrupting this place of the *Corinthians*, (translating *Totam Fidem* for *Omniem Fidem*) thinks to exempt from the Apostles Words, their special Justifying *Faith*; whereas it may be easily seen, that *St. Paul* names and means *All Faith*, as he doth *All Knowledge*, and *All Mysteries*, in the fore-going words. And *Luther* confesses, That he thrust the word *only* [*Only Faith*] into the Text.

(c) Also by his Falsifying this Text of *St. James*, he would have his Reader to think, (as he also expounds it) *That Faith was an Efficient Cause, and fruitful of Good Works*; whereas the Apostles words are plain, That *Faith* wrought together with his works; yea, and that his *Faith* was by Works made perfect. This is Impudent handling of Scripture, to make *Works* the Fruit only, and Effect of *Faith*; which is their Heresie.

(d) Again, In all those places of the Gospel, where our Blessed Saviour requires the Peoples *Faith*, when he heal'd them of Corporal Diseases only; they gladly translate, *Thy Faith hath saved thee*, rather than, *Thy Faith hath heal'd thee*; or, *Thy Faith hath made thee whole*. And this they do, that by joyning these words together, they may make it found in the Ears of the People, That *Faith* saves and justifies a Man: For so *Beza* notes in the Margent, *Fides Salvat, Faith Savereth*: Whereas the *Faith* that was here required, was of *Christ's* Omnipotency only, and Power; which *Beza* confesses, may be in the Devils themselves; and is far from the *Faith* that justifies.

But they will say, The *Greek* signifies as they translate: I grant it does so; but it signifies very commonly to be healed Corporally; as (by their own Translation) in these places, *Mark 5. ver. 26. Luk. 8. ver. 36, 48, 50.* and in other places, where they translate, *I shall be whole, They were Healed, He was Healed, She shall be made whole*. And why do they here translate so? Because they know, *To be Saved*, imports rather the Salvation of the Soul: And therefore, when *Faith* is joyn'd with it, they translate rather *Saved* than *Healed*, to insinuate their Justification by *Only Faith*.

But how contrary to the Doctrine of the Ancient Fathers this Protestant Error of *Only Faith* justifying is, may be seen by those who please to read *St. Augustin, De Fide & Opere*, c. 14.

To conclude, I will refer my Protestant Solidian to the Words of *St. James* the Apostle; where he will find that *Faith* alone, without *Works*, cannot Save him.

St. Chryl.
Theodoret.
Theophyl.
upon Rom.
10.
St. Chryl.
Hom. 19. c.
10. ad Heb.

Luther, To.
2. fol. 405.
Edit. Witte.
Anno 1551

Beza, Ann.
in 1 Cor.
13. 2.

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An. Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
II Thessal. cap. 2. ver. 15.	(a) <i>Itaque Fratres state & tenete Tra- ditiones [παράδοσις] quas didicistis, sive per sermonem sive per Epistolam nostram.</i>	Therefore, Bre- thren, stand and hold the <i>Traditions</i> which you have learned, whether it be by Word, or by our Epistle.	(a) For <i>Traditi- ons</i> , they say, <i>Ordi- nances</i> .	Corrected.
II Thessal. cap. 3. ver. 6.	--- <i>Ut subtraha- tis vos ab omni fratre ambulante inordinatè, & non secundum Tra- ditionem, quam acce- perunt à nobis.</i>	--- That you with- draw your selves from every Brother walking inordinate- ly, and not accord- ing to the <i>Tradition</i> which they have re- ceived of us.	Instead of <i>Tradi- tion</i> , they translate, <i>Instructions</i> .	Corrected.
I Corinth. cap. 11. ver. 2.	<i>Laudo autem vos fratres quod per om- nia mei memores estis, & sicut tradidi vobis, Præcepta mea tenetis. [καὶ ὡς παρέδοκα, οὕτως παράδοσις κατέχετε.]</i>	And I praise you Brethren, that in all things you be mind- ful of me, and as I have delivered unto you, you keep my Precepts.	--- And keep the <i>Ordinances</i> , as I have Preached unto you.	--- And keep the <i>Ordinances</i> , as I have delivered them to you.
Collossians cap. 2. ver. 20.	(b) <i>Si ergo mortui estis cum Christo ab Elementis huius Mun- di: quid ad huc tanquam viventes in mundo decernitis. [τὴν δογματίζεσθε.]</i>	(b) If then you be dead with Christ from the Elements of this World, why do you yet decree as living in the World?	(b) If ye be dead with Christ from the rudi- ments of the World, why, as though living in the World. Are ye led with Traditions? And, Are ye bur- thened with Tradi- tions?	--- Why, as tho living in the World, are you <i>Subject</i> to <i>Ordinances</i> ?
I Peter, cap. 1. ver. 18.	(c) <i>Scientes quod non corruptibilibus au- ro vel argento re- dempti estis de vana vestra conversatione Paternæ traditionis. [ἐκ τῆς ματαιᾶς ἡμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατρὸς παράδο- σις.]</i>	(c) Knowing that not with corruptible things, Gold or Sil- ver, you are redeem- ed from your vain conversation of your Fathers Tradition.	(c) You were not Redeemed with Corruptible things, Gold or Silver, from your vain conversation received by the Tra- dition of the Fathers.	--- From your vain conversation re- ceived by Tradition from your Fathers.

A General Mark, wherewith all *Hereticks*, that have ever disturb'd GOD's Church, have been branded, is, *To reject Apostolical Traditions*, and to fly to the *Scripture*, as by themselves Expounded, for their *ONLY Rule of Faith*. We read not of any Heresie since the Apostles Time, in which this Character has been more deeply stamp'd, than in those of this last Age, especially the first Heads of them; and those who were the Interpreters and Translators of the Scriptures; who we find to have been posselt with such Prejudice against *Apostolical Tradition*, that wherefoever the Holy Scripture speaks against certain Traditions of the *Jews*, there all the *English* Translations follow the *Greek* exactly, never omitting to translate the *Greek* word, [*παράδοσις*] *Tradition*. Contrariwise, Wherefoever the Sacred Text speaks in commendation of *Traditions*; to wit, such *Traditions* as the Apostles delivered to the Church, there (a) all their first Translations agree not to follow the *Greek*, which is still the self-same word; but for *Traditions*, translate *Ordinances* or *Institutions*, *Preachings*, *Institutions*, and any word else, rather than *Tradition*: Insomuch, that *Beza*, the Master of our *English* Scripturists, translates the word [*παράδοσις*] *Traditam Doctrinam*, the Doctrine delivered, putting the Singular Number for the Plural, and adding *Doctrine* of his own accord.

2 Theſſal.
2. 3.

Who could imagine, that their Malice and Partiality against *Traditions* were so great, that they should all agree (in their first Translations I mean; for they could not but Blush at it in their last) with one consent so duly and exactly, in all these places (set down in the former Page) to conceal and suppress the word *Tradition*, which, in other places, they do so gladly make use of? I appeal to their Consciences, whether these things were not done on purpose, and with a very wicked Intention, to signify to the Reader; that all *Traditions* are to be reprov'd and rejected, and none allow'd?

(b) In some places, they do so gladly use this word *Tradition*, that rather than want it, they make bold to thrust it into the Text, when it is not in the *Greek* at all; as you see in this place of the Epistle to the *Colossians*.---Why, as tho' living in the World, are you led with *Traditions*? and as another *English* Bible reads more Heretically, *Why are ye Burthened with Traditions*. Doubtless, they knew as well then, as they do now at this day, that this *Greek* word [*δύζωμα*] doth not signify *Tradition*; yea, they were not Ignorant, when a little before, in the same Chapter, and in other places, themselves translate [*δύζωμα*] *Ordinances*, *Decrees*. Was not this done then, to make the very Name of *Tradition* Odious among the People?

Bib. 1579.

Col. 2. 14.
Eph. 2. 15.

And tho' some of these gross Corruptions are Corrected by their last Translators; yet we have no reason to think they were Amended out of any good or pure Intention, but the rather to defend some of their own *Traditions*, viz. Wearing of the Rochet, Surplis, Four-corner'd Cap, keeping the first day in the Week Holy, Baptizing Infants, &c. All which things being deny'd by their more refin'd Brethren, as not being clearly to be prov'd out of Scripture; and they having no other refuge to fly to but *Tradition*, were forced to translate *Tradition* in some places, where it is well spoken of. But, I say, this could not be out of any pure Intention of Correcting the Corrupted Scripture; but rather for the said self-end, which appears evidently enough from their not also Correcting other notorious Falsifications, (as 1 Per. 1. 18.) (c) *You were not redeemed with Corruptible things, from your vain Conversation received by Tradition from your Fathers*; where the *Greek* [*ἐν τῇ ματαιᾷ συζήτησιν ἀναστροφῆς παρὰ παράδοσιν*] is rather to be thus translated, (and 'tis the *Greek* they pretend to follow, and not our Vulgar *Latin*, which they condemn) *From your vain Conversation delivered by the Fathers*: But because it sounds with the Simple People, to be spoken against the *Traditions* of the *Roman Church*, they were as glad to suffer it to pass; as the former Translators were, for the same reason, to foist in the word *Tradition*; and for *Delivered*, to say, *Received*: I say, because it is the Phrase of the *Catholic Church*, That it has *received* many things by *Tradition*, which they would here Controul by likeness of Words, in their False Translations. But concerning the word *Tradition*, they will tell us, perhaps, The Sense thereof is included in the *Greek* Word, *Delivered*: We grant it. But would they be content, if we should always expressly add *Tradition*, where 'tis so included? Then should we say in the *Corinthians*, *I praise you, that as I have delivered to you (by Tradition) you keep my Precepts or Traditions*.—And again, *For I received of our Lord, which also I delivered unto you (by Tradition)*.—And in another place, *As they (by Tradition) delivered unto us, which from the Beginning saw, &c.* and such like, by their Example, we should translate in this sort. But we use not this Licentious manner in translating Holy Scriptures; neither is it a Translators part, but an Interpreters, and his that makes a

1 Cor. 11. 2.
2 Cor. 23.
Luk. 1. 2. 1.

Discover.
of the Rock,
pag. 147.
Beza Pref.
in Novum
Testa. 1556.

Commentary : Nor does a good Cause need other Translation, than the express Text of the Scripture gives.

But if you say, That our Vulgar *Latin* has, in this place, the word *Tradition*; We grant it has so; and therefore, we also translate accordingly : But you (as I hinted above) profess to translate the *Greek*, and not our Vulgar *Latin*, which you condemn as Papistical, and say it is the worst of all, (tho' *Beza*, your Master, pronounces it to be the very best): And will you, notwithstanding, follow the said Vulgar *Latin*, rather than the *Greek*, when you find it seem to make for your purpose? This is your Partiality and Inconstancy. One while you will follow it, tho' it differ from the *Greek*; and another time you reject it, tho' it agree with the *Greek* most exactly; as we have shewn you above (*Col. 2. 20.*) where the Vulgar *Latin* hath nothing of *Traditions*, but, *Quid decernitis*, as it is in the *Greek*; yet there your sincere Brethren translate, *Why are ye burthened with Traditions?*

Is not all this to Bolster up their Errors and Heresies, without all respect of following sincerely, either the *Greek* or *Latin*? The *Greek*, at least, why do they not follow? Doth the *Greek* [*μεγαλοβου*] induce them to say, *Ordinances for Traditions?* Or [*δωματα*] lead them to say, *Traditions for Decrees?* Or [*δικαιωματα, πρεσβυτερος, εδους, εδουλον, &c.*] force them to translate *Ordinances for Justifications, Elder for Priest, Grave for Hell, Image for Idol, &c.*? No! Where they are afraid of disadvantaging their Heresies, they scruple not to reject and forsake both the *Greek* and *Latin*.

Tho' Protestants, in the last Translation of the Bible, have indeed Corrected this Error in several places (not in all) on purpose, thereby to defend themselves against their Puritannical Brethren, when they charge them with several Popish Observations, Ceremonies, and Traditions, which they cannot maintain by Scripture alone, without being forc'd (as is said) to fly to unwritten Traditions: Yet, when they either Dispute with, or Write against *Catholicks*, they utterly deny Traditions, and stick fast to the Scripture ALONE, for their ONLY Rule of Faith: Fallly Asserting, That the Scripture was receiv'd by the Primitive Church, as a Perfect Rule of Faith.

These are the Words of a late Ministerial *Guide of the Church of England, *The Scripture was yet (viz. when St. Augustin was sent into England) received as a PERFECT RULE OF FAITH*: For which he cites other Authority like his own. But how true this is, let the Holy Fathers of the first Five Hundred Years satisfy us.

St. Chrysostome, Expounding the Words of St. Paul, (*2 Theff. cap. 15.*) affirms, *That hereby it appears, that the Apostles did not deliver all things by Epistle, but many things without Writing; and these are worthy of Faith: Wherefore also, let us esteem the Tradition of the Church to be believed. It is a Tradition, seek no further.*

And the same Exposition is given by St. Basil, Theophilact, and St. Jo. Damascene: As also by St. Epiphanius; who says, *We must use Tradition, for all things cannot be receiv'd from Divine Scripture; wherefore the Holy Apostles have delivered some Things by Tradition: Even as the Holy Apostle says, As I have Deliver'd to you, and else-where; so I Teach, and have Delivered in the Churches.*

St. Augustin proving, That those who were Baptized by Hereticks, should not be Rebaptiz'd, says, *The Apostles Commanded nothing hereof; but that Doctrine which was opposed herein against Cyprian, is to be believ'd to proceed from their Tradition, as many things be, which the Church holds; and are therefore well believ'd to be Commanded of the Apostles, altho' they are not Written.* These words, of this great Doctor, are so clear, That Mr. *Cartwright, a Protestant, speaking thereof, says, *To allow St. Augustins Words, is to bring in Popery again.* And in another place †, *If St. Augustin's Judgment be a good Judgment, then there be some things Commanded of GOD, which are not in the Scriptures; and thereupon no sufficient Doctrine contain'd in the Scriptures.* How to make all this agree with the Doctrine of our now Ministerial Guides of the Church of England, who Teach, That in those Primitive Times, *The Scripture was receiv'd as a Perfect and Only Rule of Faith*, will be a Task, that, I am confident, no Wise Man, that has either Honour, Credit, or Respect for Truth, will venture to undertake.

* See the
Pamphlet,
call'd, a Se-
cond Def.
of the Expo-
sition of the
Doctrine of
the Ch. of
Engl. &c.
p. 13. N. 24.
St. Chryl.
in 2 Theff.
Hm. 4.
See S. Basil
de Spirit.
Sanct. c. 29.
Theophil.
in 2 Theff. 2.
Damasc. c.
17. de Imag.
Sanct.
St. Epiph.
Har. 61.
St. Aug.
de Bapt.
contr. Don.
lib. 5. c. 23.
† In Whig.
Def. p. 103.
‡ And his
Second Rep.
ag. Whig.
Part 1. pag.
84, 85, 86.

An Heret. Translation against the Sacram. of MARRIAGE. 69

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579.	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. An. Dom. 1683.
Ephesians, cap. 5. ver. 32.	Sacramentum [μυσ- τήριον] hoc magnum est.	This is a great Sacrament.	This is a great Secret.	This is a great Mystery.

THE Church of God esteems *Marriage* an Holy Sacrament, as giving Grace to the Married Persons, to live together in Love, Concord, and Fidelity. But *Protestants*, who reckon it no more than a Civil Contract, as it is among Infidels, did Translate this Text accordingly, calling it (in their first Translations) instead of a *Great Sacrament*, (or *Mystery*, as in the *Greek*) a *Great Secret*.

But we will excuse them for not translating *Sacrament*, because they pretended not to translate the *Latin*, but the *Greek*: Yet, however we must ask them, Why they call'd it not *Mystery*, as it is in the *Greek*? doubtless they can give us no other reason, but only for avoiding both those words which are us'd in the *Latin* and *Greek* Church, to signify *Sacrament*; for the word *Mystery* is the same in *Greek*, that *Sacrament* is in *Latin*: And in the *Greek* Church, the Sacrament of the *Body* and *Blood* it self, is called by the Name of *Mystery* or *Mysteries*; so that, if they should have call'd *Matrimony* by that Name, it would have sound'd to be a *Sacrament* also: But in saying, *it is a great Secret*, they are sure it shall not be taken for a *Sacrament*.

But perhaps they will say, Is not every *Sacrament* and *Mystery* in *English*, a *Secret*? Yes, as *Angel*, is a *Messenger*; *Priest*, an *Elder*; *Apostle*, *One that is sent*; *Baptism*, *Washing*; *Evangelist*, a *Bringer of Good News*; *Holy Ghost*, *Holy Wind*; *Bishop*, *Over-seer* or *Super-intendent*: But when the Holy Scripture uses these words to signify more excellent and Divine things than those of the common sort, pray does it become Translators to use *Profane* instead of *Ecclesiastical* Terms, and thereby to disgrace the writing and meaning of the Holy Ghost?

The same *Greek* word in all other places † they translated *Mystery*; who therefore can imagine any other reason for their translating of it *Secret* in this place, than lest it might seem to make against their Heretical Opinion, [*That Marriage is no Sacrament*?] tho' the Apostle makes it such a *Mystery*, (or *Sacrament*) as represents no less than the Conjunction of *Christ* and his *Church*, and whatsoever is most excellent in that Conjunction.

And *St. Augustine* teaches, That — *A certain Sacrament of Marriage is commended to the Faithful that are Marry'd; whereupon the Apostle says, Husbands, Love your Wives, as Christ loved the Church.* And *Fulk* grants, That *Augustin* and some others of the *Antient Fathers* take it, That *Matrimony* is a great *Mystery* of the Conjunction of *Christ*, and his *Church*.

But because they have kept to the *Greek* in their last Translation, I shall say no more of it; nor indeed had I taken thus much notice of it, but to shew the Reader how Intolerably *Partial* and *Crafty* they were in their first Translations.

Here follow several Heretical *ADDITIONS*, and other Notorious Falsifications, &c.

† 1 Tim. 3.
Col. 1. ver.
26.
Ephes. 3.
ver. 9.
1 Cor. 15.
ver. 51.
St Aug.
de Nupt.
& Concup.
lib. 1. c. 10
Fulk in
Rhem. Test.
in Ephes. 5.
32. Sect. 5

The Book, Chapter, and Verse.	The Vulgar Latin Text.	The True English, according to the Translation at Rhemes.	Corruptions in the Protestant Bibles, Printed An.Dom. 1562, 1577, 1579	The last Translation of the Protestant Bi- ble, Edit. Lond. Anno 1683.
2 Paralip. or Chron. cap. 36. ver. 8.	(a) <i>Reliqua autem verborum Joakim, & abominationem ejus, quas operatus est & quæ inventa sunt in eo continentur in libro Regum Judæ & Is- rael.</i>	But the rest of the words of Joakim, and of his Abomi- nations which he wrought, and the things that were found in him, are contained in the Book of the Kings of Juda and Israel.	(a) The rest of the Acts of Jeho- kin, and his Abomi- nations which he did, [And carved Images that were laid to his charge] behold they are written in the Book of the Kings of Juda and Israel.	Corrected.
Acts Apof. cap. 9. ver. 22.	(b) <i>Et confunde- bat Judæos qui habi- tabant Damasci affir- mans quoniam hic est Christus.</i>	And confounded the Jews, &c. affirm- ing that this is Christ.	(b) Saul con- founded the Jews, proving [by con- ferring one Scripture with another] that this is very Christ.	Corrected.
1 St. Peter, cap. 1. ver. 25. <i>See the like Addition in 1 Corinth. cap. 9. ver. 17. St. James, cap. 4. ver. 6.</i>	(c) <i>Verbum autem Domini manet in æ- ternum; Hoc est au- tem Verbum quod E- vangelizatum est in vos.</i>	But the word of our Lord remaineth for ever; And this is the Word that is Evangelized among you.	(c) The word of the Lord endu- reth for ever: And this is the word which [by the Go- spel] was Preach- ed unto you.	----- And this is the Word, which [by the Gospel] is Preach- ed unto you.
Collossians cap. 1. ver. 23.	(d) <i>Majorem au- tem dat Gratiam.</i>	And giveth great- er Grace.	(d) But [the Scripture] offereth greater Grace.	But <i>He</i> giveth more Grace.
	(e) <i>Si tamen per- manetis in Fide fun- dati, & stabiles, & immobiles à spe Evan- gelii quod audistis, quod prædicatum est in universa Creatura quæ sub Cælo est.</i>	If yet ye continue in the Faith ground- ed and stable, and unmovable from the Hope of the Gospel which you have heard, which is Preached among all Creatures, &c.	(e) If ye conti- nue stablished in the Faith, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which you have heard [how it was] Preached. — Or, [whereof] ye have heard [how that it] is Preached. — Or, [whereof] ye have heard, [and which hath been] Preach- ed.	—— Which ye have heard, [and which was] Preached to every Creature.

(a) [Have not set down these few Examples of their Additions, as if they were all the places in the Bible, that were Corrupted after this manner; for if you observe well in the fore-going Chapters, you will find both *Additions* and *Diminutions*: And that ~~is~~ frequently done, and with such wonderful boldness, as if these Translators had been Priviledg'd by especial *License* to Add to, or *Diminish* from the Sacred Text at their pleasures: Or, as if *Themselves* had been only *Excepted* from that general Curse denounc'd, against all such, as either *Add* to, or *Diminish* from it, in the close of the Holy Bible (*Apocalips* 22. ver. 18, 19.) in these Words, *For I Testifie to every One, hearing the Words of the Prophecie of this Book: If any Man shall add to these things, GOD shall add unto him the Plagues written in this Book. And if any Man shall diminish of the Words of the Book of this Prophecy, GOD shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the Holy City, and of these things that be Written in this Book.*

Against *Holy Images* they maliciously *Add* to the Text, these words, [*Carved Images, that were laid to his charge.*] And to what intent is this, but to deceive the Ignorant Reader, and to foment his hatred against the Images of *CHRIST*, and his Saints? As they have done also in another place, (*Rom.* 11. 4.) where they maliciously *Add* the word [*Image*] to the Text, where it is not in the *Greek*, saying instead of, *I have left me Seven Thousand Men, who have not bowed their Knees to Baal*; thus, *I have left me Seven Thousand Men, who have not bowed the Knee to [the Image of] Baal.*

Bible 1562

(b) [*By conferring one Scripture with another*:] This is added more than is in the *Greek*, in favour of their presumptuous Opinion, That Conference of *Scriptures* is enough for any Man to understand them himself, and solely by his own diligence and endeavour; and thereby to reject both the Commentaries of the Doctors, and the Exposition of Holy Councils, and the Catholic Church.

Bible 1577

(c) [*By the Gospel*:] These words are added Deceitfully, and of ill Intent, to make the simple Reader think, that there is no other Word of *GOD*, but the Written Word: for the common Reader hearing this word *Gospel*, conceives nothing else. But indeed all is *Gospel*, whatsoever the Apostles Taught, either by Writing, or by Tradition, and Word of Mouth.

It is written of *Luther*, That in his First Translation of the Bible into the *German* Tongue, he left out these Words of the Apostle clearly [*This is the Word which is Evangeliz'd to you*]; because *St. Peter* does here define what is the Word of *GOD*; saying, *That which is Preached* to you, and not that *Only* which is *Written*.

Lind. Dubitat. p. 28.

(d) In this place they add to the Text, the words [*The Scripture*]; where the Apostle may say as well, and indifferently, [*The Spirit* or *Holy Ghost*] gives more Graces, as is more probable he meant, and is so Expounded of many. And so also this last Translation of theirs intimates, by putting to the Word, *He*, [*But He giveth more Grace*], tho' this is more than they know how to stand by. But they will never be brought from Inserting their Commentary in the Text, and restraining the *Holy Ghost* to one particular Sense, where his Words seem to be Ambiguous, which the *Latin* Interpreter never presumed to do; but always leaves it as open to either signification in the *Latin*, as he found it in *Greek*.

(e) In this last place, they alter the Apostles plain Speech, with certain words of their own; for they will not have him say, *Be unmovable in the Faith and Gospel, which you have heard, which has been Preached*; but, *Whereof you have heard how it was Preached*; as tho' he spake not of the Gospel Preached to them, but of a Gospel which they had only heard of, that was Preached in the World.

The Apostle Exhorts the *Collossians* to continue grounded in the Faith and Gospel, which they had heard and received of their first Apostles. But our Protestants, who with *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, and other Old Hereticks, have fallen from their first Faith, approve not of this Exhortation.

1 Tim. esp. 1. ver. 6.

'Tis certain, that these words, [*Whereof you have heard how it was Preached*] are not so in the *Greek*; but, [*Which you have heard, which has been Preached*]: As if it were said, That they should continue constant in the Faith and Gospel, which themselves had receiv'd, and which was then Preach'd and receiv'd in the whole World.

In *Cor.* cap. 14. ver. 4. where 'tis said, *He that speaketh with Tongues, Edifieth himself*; the Bible Printed 1683. translates thus, *He that speaketh in an [unknown] Tongue, Edifieth himself*: So likewise in the 13, 14, 19, and 27th. Verses, they make the same Addition: So that in this one Chapter they add the word [*Unknown*] no less than Five times to the Text, where it is not in the *Greek*. And this they do, on purpose to make it seem to the Ignorant People, That *Mas* and other

Ecclesiastical Offices ought not to be said in *Latin*: Whereas here is nothing, either Written or Meant of any other Tongues, but such as Men spoke in the Primitive Church by Miracle; to wit, Barbarous and strange Tongues, which could not be Interpreted commonly, but by the Miraculous Gift also of Interpretation: And tho' also they might by Miracle speak the *Latin, Greek* or *Hebrew* Tongues; yet these could not be counted *Unknown Tongues*, as being the common Languages of the World, and of the Faithful, and understood of the Learned in every City; and in which also the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were Written; which could not be said to have been Written in an *Unknown Tongue*, tho' they were not Penn'd in the Vulgar Language, peculiar to all People; but in a Learned and known Speech, Interpretable by Thousands in every Country, tho' not by every Illiterate Person.

I would gladly know of our Translators, what moved them to add the word [*Unknown*] in some places, and not in other some, where the *Greek* Word is the same in all? for Instance, In the Fifth Verse of this Chapter, where the Apostle wisheth that all spake with *Tongues*; they translate exactly according to the *Greek*, without adding to the Text; when in all the other places, where they think there may be some shadow or colour of having it meant of the general Tongue, and known Language of the Church, they Partially, and with a very Ill-meaning, thrust in the word *Unknown*. See the Annotations upon this place, in the *Rhemist Testament*.

Again, *Rom. 12. ver. 6, 7.* where the Apostles words are, *Having Gifts according to the Grace that is given us, different, either Prophecy according to the Rule of Faith; or Ministry, in Ministering; or He that Teaches, in Doctrine*: They, by adding several Words of their own, not found in the *Greek*, and altering others, make the Text run thus, — *Having then Gifts, differing according to the Grace that is given us, whether Prophecy [let us Prophesie] according to the Proportion of Faith; or Ministry [let us wait on our] Ministering; or he that Teaches on Teaching*.

Besides their Additions here, they pervert the Text, by changing the word [*Rule*] of Faith, into [*Proportion*] of Faith: whereby they would save their Readers to gather no more from this place, than only that their New Ministers are to *Prophecy* or *Preach*, and *wait on their Ministering*, according to the *Measure* or *Proportion* of Faith or Ability, less or more, that they are endu'd with. Whereas, by this Text, as also by many other places of Holy Writ, we may gather, that the Apostles, by Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, before they divided themselves into divers Nations, made among themselves a certain *RULE*, and *Form* of Faith and Doctrine, containing not only the Twelve Articles of the *Creed*, but all other Principles, Grounds, and the whole Platform of Christian Religion: which *Rule* was before any of the Books of the New-Testament were Written, and before the Faith was Preach'd among the Gentiles: by which *Rule*, not only the *Doctrine* of all other Inferior Teachers was to be try'd; but also the *Preaching, Writing, and Interpreting* (which is here call'd *Prophecy*) of the Apostles and Evangelists themselves, were of *GOD's* Church approv'd and admitted, or reprov'd and rejected according to this *Rule of Faith*. This *Form* or *Rule* every Apostle deliver'd by Word of Mouth, not by Scripture, to the Country by them Converted; which was also by the Apostolical Men, and those who receiv'd it entire from the Apostles, deliver'd also entire to the next following Age; which also receiving it from them, deliver'd it, as they had receiv'd it, to the succeeding Age, &c. till this our present Age.

And this is the sure Analogy of *Faith*, set down and commended to us every where for *APOSTOLICAL TRADITION*; and not the Phantastical Rule or Square, which every *Ministerial Guide*, according to his great or small *Proportion* of Faith, pretends to gather out of the Scriptures, as understood by his own private Spirit, and wrested to his Heretical purpose; by which he will presume to judge of, and censure the Fathers, Councils, Church, yea, the Scripture it self. In the Primitive Church, as also in the Church of *GOD*, at this day, all *Teaching, Preaching, and Prophecy* is not measur'd according to the proportion of every Mans private and peculiar Spirit, but by this *Rule of Faith*, first set down and delivered by the Apostles: And therefore, whatsoever Novelties or Prophecies will not abide this Test, they are justly, by the Apostles, condemned, as contrary and against the *Rule of Faith* thus delivered.

I can't omit taking notice, in this place, of two *Notorious* and *Gross Corruptions* in their first Translation, seeing they so much concern the *Church of England's Priesthood*; The first is in *Acts 1. ver. 26.* where, instead of saying, *He [Matthias] was numbred with the Eleven*; they translate, *He was [by a common consent] counted with the Eleven*. The other (already mentioned) is, *Acts*

14. ver. 22. where, for [*When they had ordain'd to them Priests in every Church,*] they say, *When they had Ordained [Elders by Election] in every Congregation.* In one of these Texts, the words [*by a common consent*], and in the other [*by Election*] are added on purpose to make the Scripture speak in defence of their making *Super-Intendants*, and *Elders by Election only*, without *Consecration* and *Ordination*, by Imposition of Hands: By which corrupt *Additions* it evidently appears to have been the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in those days, that *ELECTION* only, without *Consecration*, was sufficient to make Bishops and Priests.

But in their last Translation, made in the beginning of King *James* the First's Reign, they have Corrected these places, by expunging the Words formerly added. And this was done by the Bishops and Clergy, for their greater Honor, Dignity, and Authority; knowing that *Consecration* (which they thought now high time to pretend to) must needs Elevate them much above the Sphere of a bare *Election*, in which they formerly mov'd. And perhaps, another no less prevalent Reason was, that they might more securely fix Themselves in their Bishopricks and Benefices; thinking, perhaps, that Bishops Consecrated might pretend to that *Jure Divino*, which Men only Elected by the Congregation or Prince, held at the Mercy and good liking of the Electors: What other Motives induc'd them to this, matters not. However, they thought it now convenient to pretend to something more than a bare *Election*; to wit, to receive an *Episcopal* and *Priestly Character*, by Imposition of Hands: Whereas we find not, that their Predecessors, *Parker*, *Jewel*, *Horn*, &c. ever pretended to any other Character, than what they receiv'd by the Queens Letters Patents, Election, and an Act of Parliament; as is plain from the 23. and 25. of their 39 *Articles*, as well as from the Statute 8. *Eliz.* 1. and therefore were content to have the Scripture read, *He was, by a common consent, counted with the Eleven*; and, *When they had Ordained Elders by Election.*

And whereas our present *Ministerial Guides** of the *Church of England*, would gladly have People believe them to have a Succession of Bishops from the Apostolick Times to this day; Yet so far was *M. Parker*, *Jewel*, and the rest of their first Bishops, from pretending to any such *Episcopal Succession*, [*If they had been truly Consecrated, they must of necessity have own'd and maintain'd a Succession among them*] that on the contrary, they Publish'd and Preach'd many things to discredit the same: And to that purpose Falsify'd and Corrupted the Scripture against *Succession*. For in the Defence of the *Apology*† of the *Church of England*, they Write thus, — *By Succession, CHRIST saith, that Desolation shall sit in the Holy Place, and Antichrist shall press in to the room of CHRIST*; for Proof of which, they note in the Margent, *Mat. 24.* And in another place of the same Defence, they say of *Succession*; *St. Paul says to the Faithful at Ephesus, I know that after my departure hence, Ravening Wolves shall enter and succeed me; and out of your selves there shall, by Succession, spring up Men speaking perversely*: Whereas *St. Paul* has never a word of *Succession* or *Succeeding*; Nor is *Succession* nam'd in the 24th. of *St. Matthew*. So that you see, the first Bishops of the *Church of England*, not only Corrupted the Sacred Text, in Translating many places of the Bible against *Ordination*; but also, in their other Writings, Falsify'd the Scripture with their corrupt *Additions* against *Succession**: Two sufficient Reasons for us to believe, that they neither Had nor Pretended to either *Consecration*, or *Episcopal Succession* in those Days; consequently were not Consecrated at *Lambeth*, by such as had receiv'd their Consecration and Character from *Roman Catholick* Bishops, who claim it no otherwise than by an un-interrupted Succession from the Apostles, and so from *CHRIST*. And this obliges me to digress a little into

Some Considerations of those Lambeth-Records, by which Protestant Bishops endeavour to prove the Consecration of their first Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, Dr. Matthew Parker.

In the Beginning of King *James* the First's Reign, a New Translation of the Bible being undertaken, the said Falsifications of Scripture Corrected, and a full Resolution put on of Assuming to Themselves the Character of *Consecrated Bishops* and *Priests*; they thought it absolutely necessary to derive this Character from such Bishops as had been (as they thought) *Consecrated* by *Roman Catholick* Bishops; by whose Hands they would now make the World believe, the

T

First

* Dr. Tenison and A. B. in the Speculum Consider'd, p. 49. tell us, That in the C. of England they have a Succession of Bishops continued down from the Apostolick Times to this day: But to Name or Number them, they say is neither Necessary nor Useful; They might have added, nor POSSIBLE. † See the Defence of the Apol. pag. 132 and pag. 127. * The first Protestant Bishops and Clergy were so far from pretending to either Consecration or Succession, that they Corrupted the Scripture against both. The Lambeth Records Consider'd.

See Fitzherbert's Appendix to the Discovery of Dr. Andrews Abuses, Falsities and Lies, Printed Anno 1613.

We also at this day still urge our Protestant Bishops to prove their Succession. But they, instead of doing it, wave us off with these words, To Name or Number our Bishops, is neither useful nor necessary. Vid. Supr.

See Stapleton's return of Untruths. His Challenge to Jewel and Horn, and his Counterblast against Horn.

First of their Predecessors [*Matthew Parker*] was Consecrated with great Solemnity at *Lambeth*: To which purpose they presume to obtrude upon the World certain (before unheard of) *Records* or *Registers*. But the Age, in which the Sun first shone upon these *Records* (*viz. Anno 1613.*) not being so easily Impos'd upon as was expected, the said *Lambeth-Register* became suspected; and, for divers Reasons, detected, as a *For'd Instrument*. *Fitz-Herbert*, a Man of great Sincerity and Authority, writ against these *Lambeth-Records*, in the very Year that *Mr. Mason* (Work-Man to *Dr. Abbot*, Arch Bishop of *Canterbury*) first Publish'd them to the World. These are his Words: —

"It was my chance to understand, that one *Mr. Mason* has lately Publish'd a Book, wherein he endeavours to prove the Consecration of the first *Protestant* Bishops, by a Register, testifying, that Four Bishops Consecrated *Mat. Parker*, the first Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. Thou shalt therefore understand, *Good Reader*, That this our Exception, touching the lawful Vocation and Consecration of the first *Protestant* Bishops in the late *Queens* day, is not a New Quarrel, now lately rais'd; but vehemently urg'd divers times heretofore, by many other *Catholicks*, many Years agoe; yea, in the very beginning of the late *Queens* Reign: As namely, by two Learned Doctors *Harding* and *Stapleton*, who mightily press'd them with the defect of due Vocation and Consecration, urging them to prove the same, and to shew how, and by whom they were made *Priests* and *Bishops*: Thus he.

And to give you the words of the said Doctors: Thus writes *Dr. Harding* to *Mr. Jewel*, pretended Bishop of *Salisbury*. — "It remains, *Mr. Jewel*, you tell us, Whether your Vocation be Ordinary or Extraordinary: If it be Ordinary, shew us the Letters of your Orders: At least, shew us that you have received Power to do the Office you presume to Exercise, by due order of *Laying on of Hands* and *Consecration*: But Order and Consecration you have none: For who could give that to you of all these New Ministers, (howsoever else you call them) which he has not himself? These are his very words to *Mr. Jewel*; having but a little before urg'd him, also in the words of *Tertullian*, thus: — "You know what *Tertullian* says of such as you be, *Edant origines Ecclesiarum suarum*; We say likewise to you, *Mr. Jewel*, and that we say to you, we say to each one of your Companions: Tell us the Original, and first spring of your Church; shew us the Register of your Bishops continually succeeding one another from the beginning, so as that the first Bishop have some one of the Apostles, or of the Apostolical Men, for his Author and Predecessor, &c. Therefore (says he) to go from your Succession, which you cannot prove, and to come to your Vocation; How say you, Sir? You bear your self, as tho' you were Bishop of *Salisbury*: But how can you prove your Vocation? By what Authority Usurp you the Administration of Doctrine and Sacraments? What can you alledge for the Right and Proof of your Ministry? Who has call'd you? Who has laid Hands on you? By what Example has he done it? How, and by whom are you Consecrated? Who has sent you? Who has committed to you the Office you take upon you? &c. In this manner was *Mr. Jewel* urg'd: To all which he never reply'd, by sending *Dr. Harding* to any Register of his, or his Metropolitan's Consecration: Or by telling him, that their Consecration at *Lambeth*, was upon Record: Or that they had Authentick Testimonies to shew who Impos'd Hands upon them. And how easily had such Answers been given to these hard Questions, if there had then been extant any Authentick Register or Records of his Own, or *Matthew Parker's* Consecration at *Lambeth*?

After the same manner he is set upon by *Dr. Stapleton*, in his Answer to *Mr. Jewel's* Book, Entituled, *A Reply*, &c. "How chanc'd then, *Mr. Jewel*, (says he) That you and your Fellows, bearing your selves for Bishops, have not so much as this congruity and consent; I will not say of the Pope, but of any *Christian Bishops* at all, throughout all *Christendome*; neither are lik'd and allow'd of any one of them all; but have taken upon you that Office, WITHOUT ANY IMPOSITION OF HANDS; without all Ecclesiastical Authority, without all Order of Canons and Right? I ask not, Who gave you Bishopricks, but, WHO MADE YOU BISHOPS? So he to *Jewel*.

And thus again, in his Counter-blast against *Horn*, pretended Bishop of *Winchester*. — "Is it not Notorious (says he to *Horn*,) That you and your Colleagues, [*Parker*, &c.] were not Ordained according to the Prescript, I will not say of the Church, but even of the very Statutes? How then can you challenge to your self the Name of the Lord Bishop of *Winchester*? And in another place he urges *Mr. Horn* with his Being without any Consecration at all of his Metropolitan, [*Parker*]; himself poor man, (says he) being no Bishop neither. Who (I say once again)

gain) can imagine, that *Jewel* and *Horn* should have been so careless of their Character and Honour, as not to have produc'd their *Lambeth-Register* and Records, [If any such Authentick Writings had then been extant] when not only their own credit, but even the credit of their Metropolitan, *Parker*, and all the rest of *Queen Elizabeth's* New Bishops; yea, the whole Succession of that Race, were so miserably Shipwrack'd? Yea, in how great stead would such *Lambeth* Writings have stood *Mr. Horn*, when he durst not joyn Issue with Bishop *Bonner*, upon the Plea, *That he was no Bishop, when he tender'd Bonner the Oath of Supremacy.*

The Case was thus: By the first Session of that Parliament 5. *Eliz.* 1. Power was given to any Bishop in the Realm, to tender the Oath of Supremacy (Enacted 1. *Eliz.*) to any Ecclesiastical Person within his Diocess; and the Refuser was to incur a Premunire. By Vertue of this Statute, *Mr. Robert Horn*, pretended Bishop of *Winchester*, tenders the Oath unto Doctor *Bonner*, (Bishop of *London*, but depriv'd by *Queen Elizabeth*, and then a Prisoner in the *Marshalsea*, which was within the Diocess of *Winchester*): *Bonner* refuses to take it. *Horn* certifies his Refusal into the *King's-Bench*; whereupon *Bonner* was Indicted upon the Statute. He prays Judgment, Whether he might not give in Evidence upon this Issue, *Quod ipse non est inde culpabilis, eo quod dictus Episcopus de Winchester, non fuit Episcopus tempore oblationis Sacramenti.* "That he was not culpable, because the said *Horn*, call'd Bishop of *Winchester*, was not Bishop when he tender'd him the Oath. And it was resolv'd by all the Judges at *Sergeants-Inn*, in Judge *Caullin's* (the chief Justices) Chamber, *That if the Verity and matter be so indeed, he should well be received to give in Evidence upon this Issue, and the Jury should try it.* Now, what the Tryal was, appears by that he was not Condemned, nor ever any further troubled for that Case, tho' he was a Man especially aim'd at. And at the next Session of that Parliament (which was 8. *Elizabeth*) they were forc'd (for want, you see, of a better Character) to beg they might be declar'd Bishops by Act of Parliament.

Besides, 'tis no more credible, that such knowing and consciencious Men, as *Dr. Stapleton*, *Dr. Harding*, *Constable*, *Kellison*, &c. then living in *England*, and probably at *London*, would Question so publick and solemn an Action; than it is, that a Sober Man should now call in doubt King *JAMES* the Second's Coronation at *Westminster*; or ask in Print, who set the Crown upon his Head, pretending he never had been Crown'd.

But in Answer to these our Objections; *Dr. Bramhall* faintly affirms, That the said Records were spoken of in the Eighth Year of *Queen Elizabeth*: For proof of which, he would gladly have the World so grossly to mistake the words of the Statute 8. *Eliz.* as to think that the mention there made of the Records of *her Majesties Father, and Brothers Time, and also of her own Time*, have relation to their *Lambeth-Register*: Whereas by the Records there spoken of, is understood only the Records of *Her Father's, Brother's, and her Own Letters Patents*; and not their (then unknown) *Lambeth-Register*.

But *Dr. Bramhall*, to make good his False Assertion, and to Impose upon the unwary Reader, most egregiously Falsifies the words of the said Statute; saying, *The Statute speaks expressly of the Records of Elections, and Confirmations, and Consecrations*: and this he puts down in a different Character, as if they had been the words of the very Statute it self: Whereas, in all the Statute, are not found any such Words as [*Records of Elections, and Confirmations, and Consecrations*] But you will find in the said Statute, expressly these words, [*As by Her Majesties said Letters Patents, remaining on Record, more plainly will appear.*] Which, if attentively consider'd, is sufficient to convince the Reader, that, *The Records of Her Majesty's said Father and Brother's Time, and also of her Own Time*, relate not to any Records or Registers of the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*; but only to the Records of the King's and Queen's *Letters Patents*. This device of *Bramhall*, is more fully Answer'd and Refuted by the Author of the *Nullity of the Prelatick Clergy of England*; whither I will refer my Reader.

Again, *Protestants* tell us further, That there is a Register of their Bishops, found in a Book call'd *Parker's Antiquitates Britannica*; which I deny not: But to this I Answer, That the said Register is Forg'd and Foisted into *Parker's Antiquitates Britan.* For that Edition, Printed Anno 1605. is the first that ever mentioned any such Thing: The old Manuscript of that Book, having no such Register at all in it; As a Learned Author*, who diligently examin'd the same, affirms in these words, --- *In the Old manuscript of that Book [Park. Antiq. Brit.] which I have seen, and diligently examin'd, there is not any mention or memory at all of any such Register or Consecration of*

See Abridg. of
Dyer's Reports.
fol. 234.

In this Statute
is expressly
mention'd her
Majesty's Fa-
thers and Bro-
thers Letters
Patents; and
also, Her own
remaining on
Record.

Antiq. Brit.
Edit. Hanov.
A. no 1605.
* The Auth.
of a Book
call'd, The
Judgment of
the Apostles
and first Ac.

in points of
Doctrine, &c
Printed in the
Year 1633.
See Pag. 109,
211, and 394.

Stat. 1. 8. Eliz.

Mason lib. 3.
p. 116.

Mat. Parker, or any One of those pretended Protestant Bishops, as the obtruded Register speaks of. And any man reading the Printed Book, will easily see, that 'tis a meer Falsified and Inserted thing; having no Connection, Correspondence, or Affinity, either with that which goes before or follows: And contains more things done after Mat. Parker had written that Book. Yet this very Register mentions not any certain Place or Form of their Consecration: So that it might be perform'd as well at the Naggs-Head, as at Lambeth. And indeed, we deny them not to have had a certain kind of Puritannical Consecration, by John Scorey, at the Naggs-Head in Cheapside: But we deny the said Naggs-Head Consecration to be either Valid or Legal, both for Defect in the Form, and in the Minister; John Scorey himself, being no Bishop, no more than Barlow and Coverdale, as is hinted above, in Pag. 35. By reason of which defects, the Queen, it seems, was forc'd, afterwards to declare, or make them Bishops by Act of Parliament. But to pass by these things, and to come to a closer Examination of their Lambeth Records:

Mr. Mason, the very first Man that ever told us of this Lambeth-Register, urges it in this manner,—"Queen Mary Died in the Year 1558. the 17th. of November; the same day Died Cardinal Pool, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury; and the very same day was Queen Elizabeth Proclaim'd. The 15th. of January next following, was the day of Queen Elizabeth's Coronation, when Dr. Ogletrop, Bishop of Carlisle, was so Happy as to set the Diadem of that Kingdom upon her Royal Head. Now the See of Canterbury continued void, till December following; about which time the Dean and Chapter having received the Congè D'Esire, Elected Master Dr. Parker for their Arch-Bishop, *juxta morem Antiquum & Laudabilem Consuetudinem Ecclesie predictæ ab antiquo Usitatam & inconcussè observatam*, Proceeding in this Election according to the Ancient manner, and the Laudable custom of the aforesaid Church; citing for these words, his New found Register, [Ex Regist. Mat. Parker.] After which Election, orderly perform'd, and signify'd according to the Law, it pleased Her Highness to send Her Letters Patents of Commission, for his Confirmation and Consecration to Seven Bishops: whose Names, with as much of the Commission as is necessary, he sets down; after which he tells us, "That to take away all scruple, he will Faithfully deliver out of Authentical Records, (as he calls them, putting in the Margent, Ex Regist. M. Parker, with as much confidence, as if they had been made known to the World, and Publish'd or produc'd upon all Occasions, for Fifty Years together, before ever he spoke of them)" both the Day when he [Mr. Parker] was Consecrated, and by Whom, viz.

Anno 1559. Mat. Park Cant. Conf. 17. Decemb. By

{ William Barlow.
John Scorey.
Miles Coverdale.
John Hodgskins.

Bram. p. 83:

These are Mr. Mason's Obtruded Records; with which let us compare the Words of another Recorder [Dr. Bramhall,] who after having told us of Mat. Parkers being, by Congè D'Esire, Elected Arch Bishop of Canterbury, says, "The Queen, accepting this Election, was graciously pleased to Issue out TWO Commissions for the Legal Confirmation of the said Election, and Consecrating of the said Arch-Bishop: The former dated the 9th. of Septemb. Anno 1559. directed to Six Bishops; Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham; Gilbert, Bishop of Bath; David, Bishop of Peterborough; Anthony, Bishop of Landuff; William Barlow, Bishop; and John Scorey, Bishop Which Commission he sets down at large, from Ro. par. 2. 1. Eliz. Dated, Apud Redgrave, No-no Die Septembris Anno Regni Elizabethæ Angliæ, &c primo.

Per breve de privato Sigillo

- Examinatur Ri. BROUGHTON.

Pag. 85.

Then he goes on, — "Now if any Man desire a Reason why this first Commission was not Executed, the best Account I can give him is this, That it was directed to Six Bishops, without an [Ant minus, Or at the least Four of you;] so as if any one of the Six were Sick or Absent

" Absent, or Refus'd, the rest could not proceed to *Confirm* or *Consecrate*. And that some of them did refuse, I am very apt to believe, because Three of them, not long after, were Depriv'd: *Thm Dr. Bramhall*.

The Three Bishops, he means, that were (as he would have us believe) Shortly after Depriv'd, were *Cuthbert Tunstall*, Bishop of *Durham*; *Gilbert Bourn*, Bishop of *Bath*; and *David Pole*, Bishop of *Peterborough*. But according to *John Stow*, and *Hollinshead*, these Three Bishops, with other Ten or Eleven, all Catholicks, were Depriv'd and Depos'd from their Sees, in July before, for refusing the Oath of Supremacy. " In the Month of July, (says *Stow*) the Old Bishops of England, then living, were call'd and examined by certain of the Queens Majesty's Council, where the Bishops of *York*, *Ely*, and *London*, with others, to the Number of Thirteen or Fourteen, for refusing to take the Oath, touching the Queen's Supremacy, and other Articles, were depriv'd from their Bishopricks. *Hollinshead* has also the same words, and tells us further, who Succeeded in their rooms and places.

See Jo. Stow and Hollinshead in An. 1. Eliz.

Hollinshead, in the Praises of Bishop *Tunstall* of *Durham*, has these words: " He was, by the Noble Queen *Elizabeth*, depriv'd of his Bishoprick, &c. and was committed to *Matthew Parker*, Bishop of *Canterbury*, who us'd him very Honourably, both for the Gravity, Learning, and Age of the said *Tunstall*: But he, not long remaining under the Ward of the said Bishop, did shortly after, the 18th. of November, in the Year 1559. depart this Life at *Lambeth*, where he first receiv'd his Consecration. [By this it appears, That *Matthew Parker* was Bishop of *Canterbury*, and liv'd in the Bishops Palace at *Lambeth*, consequently Install'd in the Bishoprick, which he could not be, before he was Consecrated (if Consecration was then us'd); and all this before the 18th. of Novemb. 1559]

And well might he, by this time, be in the full Enjoyment and Possession of the Bishoprick of *Canterbury*; for by *Stow* and *Hollinshead* we find him call'd Bishop Elect on the 9th. of Sept. when He and Others assisted at the King of *France's* Obsequies. Yea, by *Hollinshead* it evidently appears, That they were Elected immediately (or however very shortly) after the Deprivation of the Old Catholick Bishops: For, on the 12th. of August, we find *Dr. Grindall* not only call'd Bishop Elect, but exercising as much Power, as if he had been more than only Elect. His words are these: " On the 12th. of August, being Saturday, the High Altar in *Paul's Church*, with the Rood, and the Images of *Mary* and *John*, standing in the Rood-Loft, were taken down; and this was done by the command of *Dr. Grindall*, newly Elect Bishop of *London*.

The Truth of what I have here set down from *Hollinshead* and *Stow*, is unquestionable: But if it agree not with *Mr. Mason*, and *Dr. Bramhall*, and their *Lambeth*-Records, shall we not have just cause to reject these as Forg'd? But, before we compare them together, let us first see what consent and agreement is found among the Records and Recorders themselves.

First, In the Queens Letters Patents, or Commission for Consecrating *Mat. Parker*; the Suffragan Bishop, there mentioned, is named *Richard*, Suffragan of *Bedford*; Whereas by *Mr. Mason* and others, he is called *John*: Yea, *Mason* calls him *John* in one place, and *Richard* in another. I suppose those, who made these Records, might be Ignorant of the said Suffragan's Name; and therefore, for making sure work, calls him sometimes *Richard*, sometimes *John*: But if these Records had been made while the Man himself was living, and when he impos'd Hands on *Mat. Parker*, he could have satisfi'd them of his True Name, and the Place where he was Suffragan, viz. Whether of *Bedford* or *Dover*? And whether there was any other Suffragan there besides himself, if we may suppose that the *Lambeth Notarius Publicus* could be Ignorant of such circumstances?

See D. Bramhall. p. 87, 89, 90.

Secondly, *Mr. Sutcliff* affirms, That *Parker* was Consecrated by *Barlow*, *Coverdale*, *Scory*, and Two Suffragans. But by our pretended Register, we find but One Suffragan at that Solemnity.

Sutcliff ag. Dr. Kellison. p. 5. Butler Ep. de Consecrat. Ministr. Eram. p. 83.

Thirdly, *Mr. Mason*, and his Records, stile him Suffragan of *Bedford*: But by *Dr. Butler* he is call'd Suffragan of *Dover*.

Fourthly, In *Mr. Mason*, we hear tell but of One Commission from the Queen, for the Conformation and Consecration of *M. Parker*. But *Bramhall*, by more diligent search among the Records, finds Two; the first dated September the 9th.

Fifthly, By which Commission it appears, *Parker* was Elected before the 9th. of September: But *Mr. Mason* says, He was Elected about the beginning of December.

Thus they concur one with another: And to compare them with *R. Hollinshead*, and *Jo. Stow's* Chronicles, they jump as exactly, as if the One had been Written at *China*, and the Other at *Lambeth*: For,

Sixthly, Mr. *Mason*, I say, affirms, That the Dean and Chapter Elected *Dr. M. Parker* about the Month of *December*. But in *Stow* and *Hollinshead*, we find him and others call'd *Bishops Elect*, on the 9th. of *September*. Yea, seeing *Hollinshead* calls *Grindall* Newly Elect on the 12th. of *August*; we may easily conclude, that *Mat. Parker* [the Metropolitan] was also Elected before that Time; which, you see, is about Four Months before *Mason's* Election by *Conge d'Esire*.

Seventhly, Mr. *Mason* affirms, That the See of *Canterbury* continu'd void till *December* 1559. On the 17th. of which Month (according to the New Register) *Parker* was Consecrated. But in *Hollinshead* we find, that *Mat. Parker* was Bishop of *Canterbury*, and liv'd in the Bishops Palace at *Lambeth*, where he had Bishop *Tonstal* committed [Prisoner] to his charge, long before the 17th. of *December*: For on the 18th. of *November*, 1559. the said Bishop *Tonstal* Died.

Eighthly, *Dr. Bramhall*, (as is said) from our New-made Records, brings us a Commission, dated on the 9th. of *September* 1559. And directed (besides others) to Three Catholick Bishops, [*Cuthbert Tonstal*, *Gilbert Bourn*, and *David Pool*] requiring them to Confirm and Consecrate *M. Parker*. And has the confidence to affirm, That the said Three Bishops were shortly after depriv'd from their Bishopricks, as he is very apt to believe, for refusing to Obey the said Commission. But in *Stow* and *Hollinshead* we find, That the said Three Catholick Bishops (with Ten or Eleven others) were depriv'd of their Bishopricks in the Month of *July* before, for refusing the Oath of Supremacy: And *Mason* himself confirms this, by acknowledging, they were depriv'd not long after the Feast of *St. John Baptist*: For which he also cites *Samnders, lib de Schismate Angl*. But pray consider, Sirs; What can be more Absurd, than to imagine that *Queen Elizabeth* would be beholden to such *Roman Catholick Bishops*, as she had formerly Depriv'd of their Bishopricks, and made Prisoners, for the Confirming and Consecrating of Her New Protestant Bishops, who were to be unlawfully Intruded into their Sees; especially she having, as *Bramhall* says, Protestant Bishops enough of Her own; or if such had been wanting, might (he says) have easily had store of Bishops out of *Ireland*, to have done the work?

Pray give me leave to demand of our *English* Prelates, Why this first Commission was by the *Queen* directed to those Three Zealous Catholick Bishops, and not rather to her own Protestant Bishops, to whom she directed the last Commission (dated *Decemb. 6.*)? Her Majesty was not Ignorant, that their Consciences had been too tender to permit them to swear Her self Head of the Church of *England*: And that rather than Gall their so Tender Consciences, they were content to lose their Bishopricks, and suffer perpetual Imprisonment: Could she, upon revolving this in her Princely Thoughts, easily imagine that they would, without all scruple, impose hands on Her Newly Elect Bishops, whom they knew to be of a Religion as far different from Themselves, as *King Edward* the VI. was from *Queen Mary's*? Could she suppose, that they would make Bishops in that Church, whereof themselves refus'd to be Members? Could she think, that those Catholick Bishops would Consecrate *Parker*, according to *King Edward* the Sixth's Form of Consecration, which they had in *Queen Mary's* days declared to be Invalid and Null; and which, at this time, was also Illegal? Or could the *Queen* easily imagin, that *Matthew Parker* (and the rest of Her chosen Bishops, who had stood so much upon their Punctilio's at *Frankford*) would receive Consecration by a Form condemned as Superstitious and Antichristian; and from which (as *Mason* says) they had par'd away so many Superfluities; yea, so many, as even to pare out the very Name, it self, of *Bishop*? Let the Impartial Reader consider of these things.

How our present pretended Bishops Themselves will make all these things agree, will be hard to imagine: Which, if they cannot do, let them be content to leave us to our own Liberties, and freedom of Thought; and to excuse us, if we freely affirm, That *Matthew Parker* was never Consecrated at *Lambeth*: That the said Records are Forg'd: And, That Themselves are but mere Lay-men, without Mission, without Succession, without Consecration.

Ninthly, 'Tis none of the least Objections against *Parker's* Solemn Consecration at *Lambeth*, That we find it not once mentioned by the Historians of those Times, especially by *John Stow*, who profess'd so particular a Kindness and Respect to *Parker*; and who was so Exact in setting down

down all things (of far less moment) done about London. Doubtless, he omitted it not thro' Negligence or Forgetfulness, seeing he's not unmindful to set down the Consecration of Cardinal Pool, Parker's immediate Predecessor, and the very day on which he said his first Mass. Nor does it appear to have been through Forgetfulness, that *Hollinshead* mentions not this *Nororious Lambeth Solemnity*, seeing he tells us, That Bishop *Tonstal* (who Died under Parker's custody) Receiv'd his Consecration at Lambeth: If either he or *John Stow* had but given us only such a short Hint as this, of Parker's Consecration at Lambeth, we should never have questioned it further; nor have doubted of the Truth of it, tho' they had not been so exact to an Hair in every Punctilio, as to have told us of the Chappel's being Adorned with *Tapistry towards the East*; *A Red Cloth on the Floor* [in Advent]; *A Sermon, Communion, Concourse of People*; Miles Coverdale's *Side Woollen Gown*: Of the *Queens* sending to see if all things had been rightly perform'd? [What Care was here taken?] Of Answer being brought her, that there was not a Tittle amiss, only Miles Coverdale was in his *Side Woollen Gown*, at the very minute of the Consecration: Of their Assuring Her that that could not cause any Defect in the Consecration, &c. as our Records mention; which ridiculous circumstances render them not a whit the more credible.

Several ridiculous circumstances mentioned in the Records, which yet render them less credible.

If now, from what has been said, these *Lambeth* Records appear evidently to be Forg'd, to what other Refuge will these pretenders to Episcopacy have Recourse for their Episcopal Character, but to Queen *Elizabeth's* Letters Patents, and an *Act of Parliament*? If so, I see no great reason why they should find Fault with their Ancient Name and Title of *Parliamentary Bishops*. Who ever read of Bishops, between St. Peter's Time and Parker's, that stood in need of an *Act of Parliament* to declare them such? Doubtless, if they had been Consecrated at Lambeth by Imposition of the Hands of true Bishops, (tho' All their Consecrators had been in *Side Woollen Gowns*, and neither *Tapistry towards the East*, nor *Red Cloth on the Floor* of the Chappel) and could have shewn Authentick Records of the same, they would never have desir'd the Queen to Make and Declare them Bishops by *Act of Parliament*: Nor would the Queen, and the Wisdom of the Nation, have consented to the making of such a Superfluous *Act*, if their Reverences had desir'd it. No! no! there would have been no more need of any such *Act* for Them then, than there had been for Threescore and Nine preceding Arch-Bishops of *Canterbury*.

After all this, will arise yet another Query; to wit, By what Form of Consecration *Matthew Parker* was Consecrated? Our present Prelates and Clergy will not say, I suppose, that he was made Bishop according to the *Roman Catholic* Form, tho' Queen *Elizabeth* had Reviv'd the *Act* of 25. Hen. 8. 20. which Authoriz'd the same. Nor can they say, that King *Edward* the VI. Form was then in being, in the Eye of the Law: For that part of the *Act* of *Edw. VI.* which establish'd the Book of Ordination, having been Repeal'd by Queen *Mary*, was not Reviv'd till Six Years after the pretended Consecration of *Matthew Parker*, viz. till 8 of *Eliz.* as is easily prov'd. For whereas the *Act* of 5 and 6. *Edw. 6. 1.* consisted of two parts; One, which Authoriz'd the Book of Common-Prayer, as it was then newly explain'd and perfected: Another, which establish'd the Form of Consecrating Bishops, &c. and added to the Book of Common-Prayer. This *Act*, as to both these parts, was Repeal'd 1 Queen *Mary*: and this Repeal was Revers'd 1 *Eliz. 1.* as to that part which concern'd the Book of Common-Prayer Only: For so runs the *Act*, [The said Statute of Repeal, and every thing therein contained, ONLY, concerning the said Book (viz. of Common-Prayer, Authoriz'd by *Edw. 6.*) shall be void, and of none effect]. And afterwards, 8 *Eliz. 1.* was reviv'd that other part of it, which concern'd the Form of Ordination, viz. in these words, [Such Order and Form for the Consecrating of Arch-Bishops, Bishops, &c. as was set forth in the Time of *Edw. 6.* and added to the said Book of Common-Prayer, and Authoriz'd 5 and 6 *Edw. 6.* shall stand, and be in full force; and shall from henceforth be Used and Observed. By which is as clear as the Sun at Noon-day, that *Edward* the Sixth's Form was not restored at all by 1 *Eliz.* either Expressly or in General Terms, under the Name and Notion of the Book of Common-Prayer, as Protestants would have it thought. Nay, rather it was Formally Excluded by the said *Act*, 1 *Eliz.* For that *Act* of *Edward VI.* consisting of nothing else but the Authorizing of the Book of Common-Prayer, and Establishing, and adding to it the Book of Ordination: And the *Act* of Queen *Mary* having Repeal'd that whole *Act*, as to both these parts; that *Act* of 1 *Eliz.* Reversing that Repeal, as to the Book of Common-Prayer ONLY, did plainly and directly Exclude the Repealing of it, as to the Book of Ordination; there being

nothing else to be Excluded, by that word *ONLY*, but that Book. So that it is undeniably evident, That King *Edward VI.* Form of Consecration was at that day *Illegal*. And must we imagine, that the Queen would suffer her New Bishops to be Consecrated by an *Illegal Form*, when she could as easily have Authoriz'd it by the Law, as she had done the *Roman Form*, by Reviving the *Act 25 Hen. 8.* 20? Yea, it had been as easie to make that *Form* Legal, as it was afterwards to declare them Bishops by *Act of Parliament*; and doubtless, more commendable.

But admit *Matthew Parker*, and the rest of Queen *Elizabeth's* New Bishops, were made such by this (then *Illegal*) *Form*; yet, if this *Form* prove *INVALID*, they are but still where they were before their Election, as to their Character. And that it is *Invalid*, is sufficiently and clearly prov'd by the Learned Author of *Erasmus Senior*, to whom I will refer my Reader. Yea, the *Protestant* Bishops and Clergy Themselves, have judg'd the said *Form* to be *Invalid*; and therefore thought necessary to repair the Essential Defects of the same, by adding the words *Bishop* and *Priest*: (Essential Defects, I call the want of these two words, *Bishop* and *Priest*; for if they had not been Essential, why were they added?) Yet this will not serve their turn; for before they can have a true Clergy, they must change the Character of the *Ordainers*, as well as the *Form of Ordination*. A *Valid* Form of Ordination, pronounc'd by a Minister, not *Validly* Ordain'd, gives no more Character, than if it had continu'd still *Invalid*, and never been alter'd. The present *Protestant* Bishops, who chang'd the *Form* of their own Consecration upon their Adversaries Objections of the *Invalidity* thereof (for immediatly after *Erasmus Senior* was published against it, they alter'd it, viz. *Anno 1662.*) might as well submit to be Ordain'd by *Catholic Bishops*; or else, with the *Presbyterians*, utterly deny an Episcopal Character, as allow (by altering the *Form* after so long time and dispute) that it was not sufficient to make themselves, and their Predecessors, *Priests* and *Bishops*.

What has hitherto been said, concerning the Nullity of their Character, is yet further confirm'd, by their altering of the 25. of their 39 Articles: For these first Bishops, *Parker, Horn, Jewel, Grindall, &c.* understanding in what condition they were in, for want of Consecration by Imposition of Hands, resolv'd, in their Convocation, *Anno 1562.* to publish the 39 Articles, made by *Cranmer* and his Associates, but with some Alteration and Addition; especially to that Article wherein they speak of the *Sacraments*: For,

Whereas *Cranmer's* 25 or 26 Article says nothing of Holy Orders by Imposition of Hands, or any *Visible Sign* or Ceremony requir'd therein; *Parker*, and his Bishops, having taken upon themselves that Calling, without any such Ceremony of Imposition of Episcopal Hands, (for I believe they set not much by *John Scorey's* Hands and Bible in the *Naggs-Head*); declar'd, That *God ordain'd not any Visible Sign or Ceremony for the Eve last, commonly called Sacraments*; whereof Holy Orders is One. This alteration and addition, you may see in Dr. *Heylins* Appendix to *Ecclesia Restanrata*, pag. 189 — In this Convocation, they deny'd also Holy Order to be a Sacrament; consequently, not likely to Impress any Indelible Character in the Soul of the Party Ordain'd: which Doctrine continu'd long after among them, as appears by Mr. *Rogers*, in his Defence of the 39 Articles, who affirms, that *None but disorder'd Papists will say that Order is a Sacrament*; and demands, *Where it can be seen (in Holy Scripture) that Orders or Priesthood is a Sacrament? What Form has it (says he)? What Promise? What Institution from CHRIST?* But after they began to pretend to have receiv'd an Episcopal Character from *Roman Catholic* Bishops, and to put out their *Lambeth* Records in defence of it, they dislik'd this Doctrine, and Taught the contrary, viz. That Ordination is a Sacrament. *We deny not Ordination to be a Sacrament, (says Dr. Bramhal) tho' it be not One of those Two which are generally necessary to Salvation.*

By order of this Convocation was Printed the Bible of 1562. where the aforesaid Text [*When they had Ordain'd to them Priests, &c.*] was translated, *When they had Ordain'd Elders by Election*; which, as soon as they began to thirst after the glorious Character of Priest and Bishops, they Corrected.

And tho' *Cranmer* car'd as little for any Visible Signs [*Imposition of Hands*] or Ceremonies in Ordination, as the other first *Protestant* Reformers, and according to their Practice had abjur'd the Priestly and Episcopal Character, which he had receiv'd among *Catholics*; as may be gather'd by his Words, related by *Fox* in his Degradation, thus; "Then a Barber clipp'd his Hair round about, and the Bishop scraped the tops of his Fingers, where he had been Anointed, &c. when

Defence of
the 39 Article.
p. 254, 255.

See Mason
and Dr. Bram.
Pag. 97.

Fox's *AB* and
Monuments
fol. 201 B.

When they were thus doing; *All this* (quoth the Arch-Bishop) *needed not, I had my self done with this geer long agoe.* And also by his Doctrine; that, *In the New-Testament, he that is appointed to be a Priest or Bishop, needs no Consecration by the Scripture; for Election thereunto is sufficient.* Tho', I say, *Cranmer* valu'd not any, Episcopal Consecration, which he had receiv'd in the *Catholick Church*; yet he presum'd not to make the denial thereof an Article of the Protestant Faith: But *Queen Elizabeth's* pretended *Bishops*, and *English Church*; in their Convocation 1562. seeing, they knew they had no Episcopal Character by Imposition of true Bishops Hands; thought fit to make it a part of the Protestant Belief, *That no such visible Sign or Ceremony was Necessary, or Instituted by CHRIST*; and therefore concluded *Holy Orders* not to be a Sacrament. And tho', I say, the *Church of England* now Teach and Practise the contrary, and in *King James the First's* Reign put out of the Text the word *ELECTION*, as an Imposition, or Gross Corruption; yet this change of the *Matter* does no more make them now true *Priests and Bishops*, than their last Change of their *Form* of Ordination, in the Year 1662. soon after the Happy Restauration of *King Charles the Second*.

Ecclesia non est, quæ Sacerdotem non habet. S. Hierom.

'Tis enough, that in this place we have prov'd these Men without *Consecration* or *Ordination*; yet seeing they Glory also in Assuming to themselves the Name of *PASTORS*, [*Pastor of St. Martins, &c.*] it may not be unseasonable to propose a few *Queries*, touching their Pastoral Jurisdiction.

I. Whether it is not a Power of the Keys, to Institute a *Pastor* over a Flock of Clergy and People?

II. Whether any but a *Pastor* can give Pastoral Jurisdiction?

III. Whether any Bishop, but the Bishop of the Diocess (or Commissioned from him, or his Superior) can Validly Institute a *Pastor*, to any Parochial Church, within such a Diocess?

IV. Whether any number of Bishops can Validly confirm or give Pastoral Jurisdiction to the Bishop of any Diocess, if the Metropolitan (or some Authoriz'd by him, or his Superior) be not One?

V. Or to the Metropolitan of a Province, if the *Primate* of the Nation (or some Authoriz'd by him, or his Superior) be not One?

VI. Whether any but the *Chief Patriarch* of that part of the World, (or Authoriz'd by him) can Validly give Pastoral Jurisdiction to the *Primate* of a Nation?

VII. Whether the Bishop of *Rome* is not *Chief Patriarch* of the *Western Church*, consequently of this Nation?

VIII. Whether *Mat. Parker*, the first Protestant pretended Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, receiv'd his Pastoral Jurisdiction from the Bishop of *Rome*, or from others by him Authoriz'd? Or,

IX. Whether those who made *Mat. Parker* *Primate of England*, or Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, had any Jurisdiction to that Act, but what they receiv'd from *Queen Elizabeth*?

X. Whether *Queen Elizabeth* had the Power of the Keys, either of Order or Jurisdiction?

XI. Whether it is not an Essential part of the *Catholick Church* to have *Pastors*?

XII. Whether Salvation can be had in a Church wanting *Pastors*?

XIII. Whether they do not commit a most Heinous Sacrilege, who having neither valid Ordination, nor Pastoral Jurisdiction, do notwithstanding take upon them to Administer Sacraments, and exercise all other Acts of Episcopal and Priestly Functions?

XIV. Whether the People are not also Involv'd with them, in the same Sin, so often as they Communicate with them In, or co-operate To, those Sacrilegious Presumptions?

XV. Whether those, who assume to themselves the Names and Offices of *Bishops* and *Priests*, take upon them to Teach, Preach, Administer Sacraments, and perform all other Episcopal and Priestly Functions, without Vocation, without Ordination, without Consecration, without Succession, without Mission, or without Pastoral Jurisdiction, are not the very Men, of whom our Blessed Saviour charg'd us to beware?

XVI. To conclude, Whether 'tis Wisdom in the People of *England*, to Hire such Men at the charge of perhaps above 1000000 *per Annum*, to lead them the broad way to Perdition?

X

Another

Mat. 7. 15.

Another Corrupt Addition against the perpetual Sacrifice of CHRIST's Body and Blood.

PROTESTANTS Teach, in the 31 of their 39 Articles, *That the Offering of CHRIST Once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation and Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole World, &c. Wherefore the Sacrifice of Masses, in which it was commonly said, That the Priests did Offer CHRIST for the Quick and the Dead, to have Remission of Pain and Guilt, were blasphemous Fables, and dangerous Deceits:* By this Doctrine the Church of England bereaves Christians of the most Inestimable Jewel, and Richest Treasure, that ever CHRIST our Saviour left to his Church; to wit, The most Holy and Venerable Sacrifice of His Sacred Body and Blood in the MASS, which is daily Offered to GOD the Father, for a Propitiation for our Sins. And because they would have this False and Erroneous Doctrine of theirs back'd by Sacred Scripture, They most egregiously corrupt the Text, *Heb. 10. ver. 10.* by adding to the same Two Words not found in the Greek or Latin Copies, [viz. *For All;*] The Apostles words being, — *In the which Will we are Sanctified by the Oblation of the Body of Jesus CHRIST once:* Which they corruptly read, in their last Translation, — *By the which Will we are Sanctified, through the Offering of the Body of Jesus CHRIST Once [FOR ALL.]* By which Addition, they endeavour to take away the DAILY Oblation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: Contradicting the Doctrine of GOD's Holy Church, which Believes and Teaches, "That our Lord God, although he was once to Offer himself to GOD the Father upon the Altar of the Cross by Death, that he might there work Eternal Redemption: Yet because his Priesthood was not to be extinguished by Death, In the last Supper, which Night he was to be Betrayed, that he might leave a Visible Sacrifice to his Beloved Spouse the Church, whereby that Bloody One, once to be performed upon the Cross, should be represented, and the Memory thereof should remain to the End of the World, and the wholesome Vertue thereof should be applied for the Remission of those Sins which we daily commit, declaring himself to be Ordained a Priest for ever, according to the Order of Melchizedek, He Offered to GOD the Father his Body and Blood, under the Forms of Bread and Wine; and under the Signs of the same Things he gave it to the Apostles, whom then he Ordain'd Priests of the New-Testament, that they should Receive it; and by these words he commanded Them, and their Successors in Priesthood, That they should Offer it, *Do ye this in Commemoration of me, &c.* And, "Because in this Divine Sacrifice, which is perform'd in the Mass, the self-same CHRIST is contain'd, and unbloodily Offered, who Offer'd himself once Bloodily upon the Altar of the Cross: The Holy Synod Teaches this Sacrifice to be truly Propitiatory, &c. Wherefore, according to the Tradition of the Apostles, it is duly Offer'd, not only for the Sins, Punishments, Satisfaction, and other Necessities of the Faithful that are Living, but also such as are Dead in CHRIST, as yet not fully Purged. This is the Catholick Doctrine, deliver'd in the Sacred Council of Trent, which the Church of England calls Blasphemy, Fables, and Dangerous Deceits; and against which they Falsifie the Sacred Text of Scripture, by thrusting into it Words of their own, which they find not in any of the Greek or Latin Copies.

But lest they may Object, That this is but a New Doctrine, not Taught in the Primitive Church, nor deliver'd down to us, from the Apostles by Apostolical Tradition: I will give you these following Testimonies from the Fathers of the first Five Hundred Years.

St. Cyprian says, "CHRIST is Priest for ever, according to the Order of Melchizedek, which Order is this, coming from this Sacrifice, and thence descending, That Melchizedek was Priest of GOD most high, That he Offer'd Bread and Wine, That he Blessed Abraham; for who is more a Priest of GOD most high, than our Lord Jesus CHRIST, who Offer'd Sacrifice to GOD the Father, and Offer'd the same that Melchizedek had Offer'd, Bread and Wine, viz. his BODY and BLOOD?"

And a little after: "That therefore in Genesis the Blessing might be rightly Celebrated about Abraham by Melchizedek the Priest, the Image (or Figure) of CHRIST's Sacrifice, consisting in Bread and Wine, went before; which thing our Lord perfecting and performing, Offer'd

*Council. Trid.
Sess. 22. cap. 1
Cap. 2.*

*Ep. 63. ad
Ceciliam.*

" Offer'd Bread, and the *Chalice* mixt with Wine; and He, that is the Plenitude, fulfill'd the Verity of the prefigured Image.

The same Holy Father, in another place, as cited also by the *Magdeburgian* Centurists, in this manner; " Our Lord Jesus *CHRIST*, says *Cyprian*, *Lib. 2. Ep. 3.* is the High Priest of *GOD* the Father; And first Offer'd Sacrifice to *GOD* the Father, and commanded the same to be done in Remembrance of him: And that Priest truly Executes *CHRIST*'s place, who imitates that which *CHRIST* did; and then he Offers in the Church a True and Full Sacrifice to *GOD*. This Saying so displeases the Centurists, that they say, "*Cyprian* affirms Superstitiously, That the Priest Executes *CHRIST*'s place in the Supper of our Lord.

St. Hierom. " Have recourse, says he, to the Book of *Genesis*, and you shall find *Melchizedek*, King of *Salem*, Prince of this City; who even there, in Figure of *CHRIST*, Offer'd Bread and Wine, and Dedicated the Christian Mystery in our Saviours Body and Blood. Again, "*Melchizedek* Offer'd not Bloody Victims, but Dedicated the Sacrament of *CHRIST* in Bread and Wine, a simple and pure Sacrifice. And yet more plainly in another place, " Our Ministry, says he, is signify'd in the Word of Order, not by *Aaron*, in Immolating Brute Victims, but in Offering Bread and Wine, that is, the Body and Blood of our Lord *JESUS*.

St. Augustin expressly Teaches, That "*Melchizedek*, bringing forth the Sacrament (or Mystery) of our Lord's Table, knew how to Figure his Eternal Priesthood. — " There first appear'd (says he in another place) that Sacrifice, which is now Offer'd to *GOD* by Christians, in the whole World.

Again, (*Conc. 1. in Psal. 35.*) " There was formerly, says he, as you have known, the Sacrifice of the *Jews*, according to the Order of *Aaron*, in the Sacrifices of Beasts, and this in Mystery: For as yet was the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of our Lord, which the Faithful know, and such as have read the Gospel: Which Sacrifice now is spread over the whole World. Set therefore before your Eyes Two Sacrifices, That, according to the Order of *Aaron*; and This, according to the Order of *Melchizedek*: For it is written, Our Lord has Sworn, and it shall not repent him, Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the Order of *Melchizedek*. And in *Conc. 2 Psal. 33.* He expressly teaches, " That *CHRIST*, of his Body and Blood, Instituted a Sacrifice, according to the Order of *Melchizedek*.

Nothing can be more plain than these words of *St. Irenaus*, in which he affirms of *CHRIST*, that, " Giving Counsel also to his Disciples, to Offer the first Fruits of his Creatures to *GOD*; not as it were needing it, but that they might neither be Unfruitful nor Ungrateful, he himself took of the Creature of Bread, and gave Thanks, saying, *This is my Body*; and likewise the Chalice, he confessed to be his Blood, which is made of that Creature which is in use amongst us, and Taught a New Oblation of the *New Testament*, which Oblation the Church receiving from the Apostles, throughout the whole World, Offers to *GOD*, to Him, who gives us Nourishment, the first Fruits of his Gifts in the *New Testament*; of whom, amongst the Twelve Prophets, *Malachy* has thus foretold: I have no will in you, [the *Jews*] says our Omnipotent Lord, and I will take no Sacrifices at your hands, because, from the rising of the Sun, to the setting thereof, my Name is Glorify'd among the *Gentiles*; and in every place, Incense is Offer'd to my Name, and A PURE SACRIFICE, because my Name is great among the *Gentiles*, saith our Lord Almighty, manifestly signifying by these things, because the former People indeed ceas'd to Offer to *GOD*; but in every place a Sacrifice is Offer'd to *GOD*, and this PURE, for his Name is Glorify'd among the *Gentiles*. Thus *St. Irenaus*, whose Words so touch the *Protestant* Centurists, that they say, "*Irenaus*, &c. seems to speak very Incommodiously, when he says, He [*CHRIST*] taught the New Oblation of the *New Testament*, which the Church receiving from the Apostles, Offer'd to *GOD* over all the World.

Eusebius Casariensis. " We Sacrifice, therefore, to our highest Lord a Sacrifice of Praise: We Sacrifice to *GOD* a Full, Odoriferous, and most Holy Sacrifice: We sacrifice after a New manner, according to the *New Testament*, A PURE HOST.

St. Jo. Chrysostome expounding the Words of the Prophet *Malachy*, says, " The Church which every where carries about *CHRIST* in it, is Prohibited from no place; but in every place there are Altars, in every place Doctrine; these things *GOD* foretold by his Prophet, for both declaring the Churches Sincerity, and the Ingratitude of the other People [the *Jews*];

In the Alphab. Table of the 3. Cent. under the Letter S. Col. 83.

Ep. ad Marcel. ut migret. Bethleem. Ep. ad Evagr. Quasi. in Gen. c. 14.

Ep. 25.

Lib. 16. de Civ. Dei c. 22. See him also lib. 17. c. 17. & lib. 18. c. 35. cum Psal. 109. lib. 1. contr. Advers. Leg. & Prophet. c. 20. Serm. 4. de Sanctis Innocentibus.

Lib. 4. Advers. Har. c. 32.

Lib. 1. demonstrat. Evang. c. 10.

Ad Psal. 95.

he tells them, I have no pleasure in you, &c. Mark, how clearly and plainly he Interprets the Mystical Table, which is the *UNBLOODY HOST*, and the pure Perfume he calls Holy Prayers, which are Offer'd after the Host. Thou sees how 'tis granted, that that Angelical Sacrifice should every where be known; thou seest it is circumscrib'd with no Limits, neither the Altars, nor the Song. In every place Incense is Offer'd to my Name; therefore the Mystical Table, the *HEAVENLY* and exceeding *VENERABLE SACRIFICE*, is indeed the prime *PURE HOST*.

Is it not a thing to be admir'd, That the Church of England should not only Corrupt the Sacred Scripture against the Great and most Dreadful Sacrifice; but also make it an Article of her Faith, that it is a blasphemous Fable, and dangerous Deceit? When, without all doubt, she cannot be Ignorant, that the Holy Fathers call it (a) *A visible Sacrifice*. (b) *The True Sacrifice*. (c) *The daily Sacrifice*. (d) *The Sacrifice according to the Order of Melchizedek*. (e) *The Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of CHRIST*. (f) *The Sacrifice of the Altar*. (g) *The Sacrifice of the Church*. (h) *The Sacrifice of the New Testament*, (i) which succeeded to all Sacrifices of the Old Testament. And that it was Offer'd for the Health of the Emperor, *Sacrificamus pro salute Imperatoris*, says Terullian, *de Scapul.* c. 2. That it was Offer'd for the Sick, *Pro Infirmis etiam Sacrificamus*, says St. Chrysostome, *Hom.* 27. in *All Apof.* For those upon the Sea, and for the Fruits of the Earth. Idem. And for the Purging of Houses Infected with Wicked Spirits St. Aug. *de Civit. Dei*, lib. 22. c. 8. says, That One went and Offer'd (in the House Infected) the Sacrifice of CHRIST's Body, praying that the Vexation might cease; and by GOD's Mercy it ceas'd immediately.

In the first Council of Nice, *Can.* 14. we find these words, 'The Holy Council has been Inform'd, That in some Places and Cities the Deacons distribute the Sacrament to Priests: Neither Rule nor Custom has deliver'd, that they who have not Power to Offer Sacrifice, should distribute the Body of CHRIST to them who Offer. — See also, *Concil.* 3. *Bracarense. Can.* 3. & *Concil.* 12. *Toler. Can.* 5. Moreover, that this Holy Sacrifice (as GOD's Church, at this day, Teaches and Practises) was Offer'd for the Sins of the Living and Dead, is a Truth undeniable, That *Craftsmen*, a Learned Protestant, in his Book of the *Mass*, against Bellarmine (Pag. 167.) reprehends Origen, St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostome, St. Augustin, St. Gregory the Great, and Venerable Bede, for maintaining *The Mass to be a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of the Living, and of the Dead*. Consider then, what Truth there is in the words of that Author^u; who affirms, That in Gregory the Great's Time, *Masses for the Dead were not intended to deliver Souls from those Torments of Purgatory*. Doubtless he consider'd not the words of St. Augustin, lib. 9. *Confess.* c. 12. and *De Verb. Apost.* *Serm.* 34. viz. *That the Sacrifice of our Price was Offer'd for his Mother Monica, being Dead*. And, *That the Universal Church does observe, as deliver'd from their Forefathers, to Pray for the Faithful Deceased in the Sacrifice, and also to Offer the Sacrifice for them*. Nor consider'd this great Vindicator, that great Miracle related by St. Gregory the Great himself, concerning *Purgatory*, and the Benefit Souls there receive, by the Offering up of this *Propitiatory Sacrifice*. In his Fourth Book of Dialogues, *cap.* 55. telling us of a Monk call'd *Iustus*, who was Obsequious to him, and watch'd with him in his daily Sickness: 'This Man (says he) 'being Dead, I appointed the Healthful Host to be Offer'd for his Absolution Thirty Days together; which done, the said *Iustus* appear'd to his Brother by Vision, and said, *I have been hitherto Evil, but now am Well, &c.* And the Brethren in the Monastery counting the Days,

found that to be the day on which the 30th. Oblation was Offer'd for him.

Nor would doubtless this Vindicator have told us, That *Transubstantiation was yet unborn*, (to wit, in Gregory the Great's Time) unless he had a mind to Impose upon his Reader, if he had ever read the Doctrine of those Fathers, who liv'd before St. Gregory's Time: For Example, St. Ignatius Martyr, in his Epistle to the People of *Smyrna*, speaking of the Hereticks of his Time (Men of the same Judgment with this Vindicator) writes thus: 'They allow now of Eucharists and Oblations, (says he) because they do not believe the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus CHRIST, which Suffer'd for our Sins, and which the Father, in his Mercy, rais'd again from the Dead.

St. Iustin Martyr, in his Apology to the Emperor *Antoninus Pius*, made for the Christians: Now this Food, says he, among us, is call'd the *Eucharist*, which it is lawful for none to partake of, but those who believe our Doctrine to be True, who have been wash'd in the Laver of Regeneration for the Remission of Sins; and who regulate their Lives according to the Pre-

scription

- (a) St. Aug. *de Civit. Dei* lib. 10. c. 19.
(b) St. Cypr. l. 2. Ep. 3.
& St. Aug. cit. c. 20.
(c) Aug. cit. c. 16. & *Conc. Tolet.* 1. *can.* 5. Origen. in *Num. Hom.* 23.
(d) S. Cypr. l. 2. Ep. 3.
& Aug. lib. 16. c. 22. *de Civit. Dei*.
(e) *Et lib.* 22. c. 8. & li. 20. *contr. Faustum* c. 18. & S. Hierom. li. 3. *contr. Pelag.* Aug. in *Plal.* 33. *con.* 2. To. 8. & S. Chryl. lib. 1. *Cor.* *Hom.* 24.
(f) S. Aug. in *Enchiridion* c. 110. & *de cura pro mortuis.* c. 18.
(g) *Et de Civit. Dei.* li. 10. c. 20.
(h) *Et de gratia Novi Test.* c. 18. & S. Irenaeus li. 4. c. 32.
(i) Aug. *de Civit. Dei* li. 17. c. 20. S. Clement. in *Apost. Constit.* l. 1. c. 1564. *Antwerp.* li. 6. c. 22. fol. 123.
* The Author of the Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, &c. p. 13.

Scripture of *Christ*: For we do not receive this as common *Bread*, or common *Drink*: but, as by the Word of *God*, *Jesus Christ*, our Redeemer, being made *Flesh*, had both *Flesh* and *Blood* for the sake of our Salvation. Just so are we taught, that that Food, over which Thanks are given by Prayers, in his own Words, and whereby our *Blood* and *Flesh* are by a change nourish'd, is the *Flesh* and *Blood* of the Incarnate *JESUS*: For the Apostles, in the Commentaries written by them, call'd the Gospels, have Recorded that *JESUS* so commanded them.

St. *Irenaeus*, taking an Argument from the Participation of the *Eucharist*, proves the Resurrection of the *Flesh* against the Hereticks of his Time. 'As the Blessed Apostles say, *Because we are Members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones*; Not speaking this of any Spiritual or Invisible Man, but of that Disposition which belongs to a Real Man, that consists of *Flesh, Nerves, and Bones*; and is nourish'd by the Chalice, which is his [*Christ's*] *Blood*, and receives encrease by that Bread which is his Body: And as the Vine, being Planted in the Earth, brings forth Fruit in Season: And a Grain of Wheat falling upon the Ground, and rotting, rises up with Encrease by the Virtue of *GOD*, who comprehends all things, which afterwards, by a Prudent management, becomes Servicable to Men; and receiving the Word of *God*, are made the *Eucharist*, which is the *Body* and *Blood* of *CHRIST*; So also our Bodies being Nourish'd by it, and laid in the Earth, and there dissolv'd, will arise at their Time; the Word of *God* working in them this Resurrection, to the Glory of *God* the Father.

Lib. 5. c. 11.

Eusebius Caesariensis. — 'Making a daily Commemoration of Him, [*CHRIST*] and daily Celebrating the Memory of his *Body* and *Blood*; and being now prefer'd to a more excellent Sacrifice and Office than that was of the Old Law, we think it unreasonable, any more to fall back to those first and weak Elements, which contain'd certain Signs and Figures, but not the Truth it self. Another place of *Eusebius* as quoted by St. *John of Damascus*, 'Many Sinners, says he, being Priests, do Offer Sacrifice, neither does *God* deny his Assistance, but by the Holy Ghost Consecrates the propos'd Gifts: And the Bread indeed is made the precious *BODY* of our Lord, and the Cup His precious *BLOOD*.'

Lib. 1. demonstrat. Evang. c. 10.

Lib. 3. Parallel. c. 45.

St. *Hilary*. 'We must not speak, says he, of the things of *GOD*, like Men, or in the sense of the World: Let us read what is Written, and understand what we read, and then we shall believe with a perfect Faith. For what we say of the Natural Existence of *Christ*, within us, if we do not learn from him, we say foolishly and profanely; for he himself says, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed*. There's no place left for doubting of the reality of his *Flesh* and *Blood*; for now, by the Profession of *Christ* himself, and by our Faith, 'tis truly *Flesh*, and truly *Blood*: Is not this Truth? It may indeed not be true to them, who deny *CHRIST* to be true *GOD*.'

Lib. 8. de Trinitate.

St. *Cyril of Jerusalem*. — 'Since therefore *Christ* himself does thus affirm, and say of the Bread, *This is my Body*; Who, from hence forward, dare be so bold as to doubt of it? And since the same [*Christ*] does assure us and say, *This is my Blood*; Who, I say, can doubt of it, and say, It is not his Blood? In *Cana* of *Galilee* he once, with his Sole Will, turn'd Water into Wine, which much resembles *Blood*; And does he not deserve to be Credited, that he chang'd Wine into his *Blood*? For, if when Invited to a Corporal Marriage, He wrought so stupendious a Miracle, have we not much more reason to confess, that he gave his *Body* and *Blood* to the Children of the Bridegroom? Wherefore, full of certainty, let us receive the *Body* and *Blood* of *CHRIST*: For under the Form of *Bread* is given to Thee the *Body*, and the *Blood* under the Form of *Wine*; that having receiv'd the *Body* and *Blood* of *CHRIST*, thou may'st be made Partaker with Him of his *Body* and *Blood*. Thus we shall become *Christophers*, that is, *Beavers of Christ*, receiving his *Body* and *Blood* into us. — Do not therefore look on it as mere *Bread* only, or bare *Wine*; for, as *God* himself has said, *IT IS* the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. Notwithstanding, therefore, the Information of *Sense*, let *Faith* confirm thee; and do not judge of the thing by the *Taste*, but rather take it for most certain by *Faith*, without the least doubt that his *Body* and *Blood* are given thee. — When you come to the Communion, do not come holding both the Palms of your hands open, nor your Fingers spread; but let your Left Hand be as it were a rest under the Right, into which you are to receive so great a KING: And in the hollow of your Hand take the *Body* of *CHRIST*, saying, *Amen*.

In Catechis.

It was the Custom in those days for the Priest to deliver the Holy Sacrament into the hand of the Communicant

In Orat. Catec.
c. 37.

St. Gregory Nyssen. 'When we have Eaten any thing that is prejudicial to our Constitution, 'tis necessary that we take something that is capable of repairing what was damnify'd; that so, when this Healing Antidote is within us, it may work out of the Body, by a contrary Affection, all the force of the Poyson. And what is this Antidote? 'Tis nothing but that *Body* which overcame Death, and was the Origine of our Life. For, as the Apostle tells us, As a little Leaven makes the whole Lump like it self; so that *Body*, which by GOD's appointment suffer'd Death, being receiv'd within our Body, changes and reduces the whole to it's own likeness. And as when Poyson is mixt up with any thing th it is Medicinable, the whole Compound is render'd useles; so likewise that Immortal Body being within him that receives it, converts the whole into its own Nature. But there being no other way of receiving any thing within our Body, unless it be first convey'd into our Stomach by Eating or Drinking, it is necessary that by this ordinary way of Nature, the Life-giving Vertue of the Spirit be Communicated to us. But now, since that Body alone, which was united to the Divinity, has receiv'd this Grace, and it is manifest, that our Body can no otherwise become Immortal; we are to consider how 'tis possible, that *One Body*, which is always distributed to so many Thousand Christians over the whole World, should be the Whole, by a Part in every One, and still remain Whole in it self.

And a little after. 'I do therefore now rightly believe, That the Bread Sanctified by the Word of God, is chang'd into the Body of God, the Word.— And here likewise the *Bread*, as the Apostle says, is Sanctify'd by the Word of GOD and Prayer; not so, that by being Eaten it becomes the *Body of the Word*, but because it is suddenly chang'd by the Word into his *Body*, by these words, *This is my Body*.— And this is effected by the Vertue of Benediction, by which the Nature of those things which appear, is Trans-elemented into it.

Again, in another place.— And the Bread in the beginning is only common Bread; but when it is Sanctify'd by the Mystery, it is call'd and made the *BODY of CHRIST*.

St. Hierom. 'God forbid (*says he*) that I should speak detractingly of these Men, [*Priests*] who succeeding the Apostles in their Function, do make the Body of *CHRIST* with their Sacred Mouth.

St. Augustin. 'We have heard (*says he*) our Master, who always speaks Truth, our Divine Redeemer, the Saviour of Men, recommending to us our Ransom, his *Blood*: For he spake of his *Body and Blood*; which *Body* he call'd Meat, and which *Blood* he call'd Drink. The Faithful understand the Sacrament of the Faithful.— But there are some, *says he*, who do not believe they said, *This is an hard saying, who can hear him?* 'Tis an hard saying but to those who are Obstinate; that is, 'tis Incredible but to the Incredulous.

The same Holy Father, and Great Doctor, in his Commentary upon the XXXIII Psalm, speaks thus of *Christ*: 'And He was carry'd in his own hands. And can this, Brethren, be possible in Man? Was ever any Man carry'd in his own hands? He may be carry'd by the hands of others, but in his own no Man was ever yet carry'd. How this can be literally understood of *David*, we cannot discover; but in *Christ* we find it verify'd: For *Christ* was carry'd in his own hands, when giving his own very *Body*, he said, *This is my Body*; for that *Body* he carried in his own hands. Such is the Humility of our Lord Jesus *Christ*, which is much recommended to Men.— How plain and positive are the words of these Ancient and Holy Fathers, for the Real Presence of *CHRIST's BODY and BLOOD* in the Blessed Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, which Protestants so flatly deny? I would ask our *Church of England* Divines, Whether (if they had been present among the Apostles when *CHRIST* said, *Take and Eat, THIS IS MY BODY*) they durst have assum'd the boldness to have contradicted the Omnipotent Word, and have reply'd, *'Tis not thy BODY, Lord, 'tis only BREAD?* I believe the most stiff Sacramentarian in *England*, would have trembl'd to have made such a Reply; tho' now they dare, with blasphemous Mouth, call the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, the *Mystery of Iniquity*.

I have insisted somewhat the longer upon these two points, than perhaps the Reader may think proper for this Treatise: But when he considers that the *Priesthood* and *Sacrifice*, against which Protestants have Corrupted the Scripture, and fram'd their New Articles of Faith, are Two such Essential Parts of Christian Religion, That if either of them be taken away, the whole Fabrick of God's Church falls to the Ground; he will not look upon it as an unnecessary Digression.

Several

In Orat. in
diem lumi-
num.
In Epist. ad
Heliodorum.

Liv. de Verb
Apost. Serm.

Several other Corruptions and Falsifications, not mentioned under the foregoing Heads.

THIS Treatise encreasing beyond what indeed I design'd it at first, will oblige me to as much Brevity as possible, in these following Corruptions.

In *Romans* 8. ver. 39. instead of the word *Charity*, they (contrary to the *Greek*) translate *Love*; and so generally in all places, where much is spoken in commendation of *Charity*; the reason is, because they attribute Salvation to *Faith* alone, they care not how little *Charity* sound in the Peoples Ears. — So likewise in the *1 Cor. cap. 13.* for *Charity*, they Eight times say *Love*. In *Rom. 9. ver. 16.* for this Text, [*Therefore it is not of the Will, nor the Runner, but of GOD that sheweth Mercy;*] they translate in their Old Bibles, — *So lyeth it not then in a Man's Will or Running, but in the Mercy of GOD;* changing [*Of*] into [*In*], and [*Willer and Runner*] into [*Will and Running*]; and so make the Apostle say, That it is not at all in Man's Will to Consent or Co-operate with GOD's Grace and Mercy.

In *1 Corinthians cap. 1. ver. 10.* for *Schisms* (which are Spiritual Divisions from the Unity of the Church) they translate *Dissentions*, which may be in Worldly things, as well as Religion; this is done because themselves were afraid to be accounted Schismaticks: So likewise,

In *Galatians 3. ver. 20.* for *Heretie*, as it is in the *Greek*, they translate *Selfs*; in favour of themselves, being charg'd with Heresie: Also,

In *Titus 3. ver. 10.* instead of saying, according to the *Greek*, *A Man that is an Heretick*, &c. Their Bible of 1562. translates, *A Man that is an Author of Selfs*: favouring that Name for their own sakes, and dissembling it as tho' the Holy Scripture spake not against *Heretie* or *Hereticks*, *Schism* or *Schismaticks*.

In *1 Timothy, cap. 3. ver. 6.* for a *Neophyte*, (one lately Baptized or Planted in *CHRIST's* Mystical Body) they translate in their first Bibles, *A Young Scholar*; as tho' an *Old Scholar* could not be a *Neophyte*, by deferring his Baptism, or by long delaying his Conversion to *GOD*, which he learn'd to be necessary long before.

In *Tit. 3. ver. 8.* instead of these words, [*To Excel in good Works,*] they translate, *To shew forth Good Works*; and (as their Last Edition has it) *To maintain Good Works*; Against the different degrees of *Good Works*.

In *Hebrews 10. ver. 20.* for *Dedicated*, they translate, in their First Bibles, *Prepared*, in favour of their *Heretie*, That *CHRIST* was not the first that went into *Heaven*, which the word [*Dedicated*] signifies.

In the II *Epistle of Peter, cap. 3. ver. 16.* they force the Text to maintain a frivolous Evasion, [*That St. Paul's Epistles are not hard,*] but the *Things in the Epistles*; whereas both the *Greek* and *Latin* Texts are indifferent to both Constructions: It is a general Custom of theirs, that where they find the *Greek* Text indifferent to Two Senses, there they restrain it only to that which may most advantage their own Error, thereby excluding its Reference to the other Sense. And oftentimes, where one Sense is receiv'd, read, and expounded of the greater part of the Ancient Fathers, and of all the *Latin* Church, there they very Partially follow the other Sense, not so generally receiv'd.

In *St. James 1. ver. 13.* for, [*God is not a Tempter of Evils.*] they translate, *God is not Tempted with Evils*, and, *God cannot be Tempted with Evils*; which is so Impertinent to the Apostles Speech in that place, as nothing more. Why is it that they refuse to say, *God is no Tempter to Evil*, as well as the other? Is it because of the *Greek* Word, which is a *Passive*? They may find in their Lexicon, that it is both an *Active* and *Passive*; as also appears by the very circumstance of the foregoing words, *Let no Man say, That he is Tempted of God.* Why so? Because (say the Protestant Translators) *God is not Tempted with Evil.* Is this a good Reason? Nothing less. How then? Because *God is no Tempter to Evil*: therefore, let no Man say, *That he is Tempted of GOD.*

This Reason is so coherent, and so necessary in this place, That if the *Greek* Word were only a *Passive* (as it is not,) yet it might have better seem'd *Beza* to translate it *Actively*, than it did

Annot. No.
Test. Anno
1556.
M. c. 6. v. 13.

to turn an *Active* into a *Passive*, against the *Real Presence*, as himself confesses he did without scruple. But tho' he might and ought to have translated this word *Actively*, yet he would not, because he would favour his own *Heretic*; which (quite contrary to these words of the Apostle) says, *That God is a Tempter to Evil*: His words are, *Inducit Dominum in tentationem eos quos Satana arbitrio permittit*, &c. 'The Lord leads into Temptation, those whom he permits to 'Satan's Arbitriment; or into whom rather he leads or brings in Satan himself, to fill their 'Heart, as *Peter* speaketh. Note, that he says, *GOD* brings Satan into a Man to fill his Heart, as *Peter* said to *Ananias*; *Why has Satan fill'd thy Heart, to lye unto the Holy Ghost?* So that by this Doctrine of *Beza's*, *GOD* brought Satan into *Ananias's* Heart to make him Lye unto the Holy Ghost; and so leading him into Temptation, was *Author* and *Cause* of that Heinous Sin.

Is not this to say, *GOD is a Tempter to Evil*, quite contrary to *St. James's* Words? Or could he that is of this Opinion, translate the contrary; to wit, *That GOD is no Tempter to Evil*? Is not this as much as to say, *That GOD* also brought Satan into *Judas* to fill his Heart, and so was *Author* of *Judas's* Treason, even as he was of *Paul's* Conversion? Is not this a most absurd and blasphemous Opinion; yet how can they free themselves from it, who allow and maintain the aforesaid Exposition of *God's leading into Temptation*? Nay *Beza*, for maintaining the same, translates, *God's Providence*, instead of *God's Prescience* (*Acts 2. ver. 23*) a Version so false, that the *English Bezites*, in their Translation, are ashamed to follow him.

And which is worse than all this, if worse can be, They make *GOD* not only a *Leader* of Men into Temptation, but even the *Author* and *Worker* of Sin; Yea, that *God* created or appointed Men to Sin; as appears too plainly, not only in their Translation of this following Text of *St. Peter's*, but also from *Beza's* Commentary on the same. Also *Bucer*, one of *King Edward* the Sixth's Apostles, held directly, * *That GOD is the Author of Sin*.

St. Peter says of the *Jews*, that *Christ* is to them, *Petra scandali qui offendunt verbo nec credunt in quo & positi sunt* [*eis & xai & rindour*]; that is, *A Rock of scandal to them* [the *Jews*] *that stumble at the Word, neither do believe wherein also they are put*, as the *Rhemist* Testament translates it: Or as 'tis render'd in *King Edward* the Sixth's *English* Translation, and in the First of *Queen Elizabeth's*, *They believe not that whereon they were set*: Which Translation *Iyricus* approves, saying, 'This is well to be mark'd, lest a Man imagine that *GOD* himself did put them, and (as *One*, meaning *Beza*, against the Nature of the *Greek* Word, translates and interprets it) that *GOD* created them for this purpose, that they should withstand him. *Erasmus* and *Calvin*, referring this word to that which goes before, Interpret it not amiss, That the 'Jews were made or ordain'd to Believe the Word of *GOD*, and their *Messias*; but yet that they would not believe him: For to them belong'd the Promises, the Testaments, and the 'Messias himself; as *St. Peter* says, *Acts 2*, and 3. and *Paul*, *Rom. 9*. And to them were committed the Oracles of *GOD*, by witness of the same *Paul*, *Rom. 3*. Thus *Illyricus*; who has here given the true Sense of this Text, according to the signification of the *Greek* Word; and has prov'd the same by Scripture, by *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, and has confirm'd it by *Erasmus* and *Calvin*. Yea *Luther* follows the same Sense in this place: So does *Castalio* in his *Anno-New-Testament*.

Yet *Beza*, against all these (to defend his blasphemous Doctrine, that *God* leads Men into Temptation, and brings in Satan to fill their Hearts) translates it thus: *Sunt immorigeri ad quod etiam conditi fuerunt*. — *They are Rebellious, whereunto also they were Created*: With whom his Scholars, our *English* Translators, are resolv'd to agree; therefore, in their Bible of the Year 1577. they read, — *Being disobedient unto the which thing they were Ordained*. And in that of 1572. *Being disobedient unto the which thing they were even Ordained*: This is yet worse. And with this, word for word, agrees the Testament of 1580. and the *Scotish* Bible of 1579. This is also the *Geneva* Translation in the Bible of 1561. which the *French Geneva* Bible follows. And how much our *Protestant* last Translation differs from these, may be seen in the Bible Printed at *London*, Anno 1683. where 'tis read thus: *And a Rock of Offence, even to them which stumble at the Word, being disobedient whereunto also they are appointed*.

Is not this to say positively, That *GOD* is *Author* of Mens Disobedience or Rebellion against *CHRIST*? 'But if *GOD* (says *Castalio* against *Beza*) have Created some Men to Rebellion 'or Disobedience, he is *Author* of their Disobedience; as if he has Created some to Obedience, 'he is truly *Author* of their Obedience. Yes, this is to make *GOD* the *Author* of Mens Sin, for

* See *Bucer's*
Scripta Angli-
cana, p. 931.
Et in Epist.
ad Rom. in
c. 1. p. 94.
1 Pet. c. 2. v. 8.

Illyricus's
Glossim 1 Pet.
c. 2. ver. 8.

Id. Castalio
in defensione
us translat.
p. 153. 154.
155.

for which purpose it was so Translated: And thus *Beza* in his Notes upon the Text explicates it; 'That Men are made or Fashion'd, Fram'd, Stir'd up, Created or Ordain'd, not of themselves (for that were absurd) but of GOD, to be Scandaliz'd at him, and his Son our Saviour; *Christus est eis offendiculo, prout etiam ad hoc ipsum à Deo sunt Conditi*: And further discourses at large, and brings other Texts to prove this Sense, and this Translation.

And tho' *Luther* and *Calvin* (as is said) dissented not from the True Sense of this Text, yet touching the blasphemous Doctrine, [*That GOD is the Author of Sin*,] they with *Zuinglius* must, for all this, have the Right-Hand of *Beza*. 'How can Man prepare himself to Good, says *Luther*, 'seeing 'tis not in his Power to make his ways Evil? For GOD works the wicked Work in the Wicked.

'When we commit Adultery or Murder, (*says Zuinglius*) 'tis the Work of GOD, being the Mover, the Author, and Inciter, &c. GOD moves the Thief to Kill, &c. He is forc'd to Sin, &c. GOD harden'd *Pharaoh*, not speaking Hyperbolically, but he truly hardens him, yea, 'although he resist. — By which, and other of his Writings, he so plainly teaches GOD to be the Author of Sin, that he is therefore particularly reprehended by the Learned Protestant *Grawerus*, in *Absurda Absurdorum* c. 5. de *Predest.* fol. 3, 4.

'GOD is Author (*says Calvin*) of all those things, which these *Papists* Judges would have to happen only by his Idle Sufferance. He also affirms our Sins to be not only by GOD's Permission, but by His Decree and Will: Which Blasphemy is so evidently Taught by him and his Followers, that they are expressly condemn'd for it, by their Famous Brethren; *Ferning. lib. de univers. Grat. p. 109.* *Osiander Enchirid. Controv. p. 104.* *Scaffman. de peccat. causis p. 155.* *Yea, Sitzlinus disput. Theol. de Provid. Dei, Sect. 141.* *Graver. in Absurda Absurd. in frontisp.* *27.* the Protestant Magistrates of *Berne* made it Penal by their Laws, for any in their Territories to Preach *Calvin's* Doctrine thereof, or for the People to read any of his Books concerning the same. Are not these blessed Reformers? O Excellent Instruments of GOD's! as *Dr. Tenison* styles the Chief of them.

Protestants denying *Free-Will* in Man, not only to do Good; but even to resist Evil, open a very wide passage into this Impious Doctrine, of making GOD the Author of Sin.

In 1 *St. Peter*, cap. 1. ver. 22. the Apostle exhorts Christians to live as becomes Men of so excellent a Vocation: Purifying, says he, your Souls by Obedience of Charity, &c. (a little before, ver. 17.) remembering always, that GOD, without exception of Persons, judges every Man according to his Works. From which places it appears, that we have *Free-will* working with the Grace of GOD; That we purifie and cleanse our Souls from Sin; That Good Works are necessarily requir'd of Christians: For by many Divine Arguments *St. Peter* urges this Conclusion, *Ut Animas nostras Castificemus, That we purifie our own Souls.* So the Protestant Translation, made in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, has it, [*Forasmuch as you have purifi'd your Souls.*] So likewise one of *Queen Elizabeth's* Bibles, [*Even ye which have purified your Souls.*] And so it is in the Greek. Notwithstanding all which, *Beza* in his Testaments of 1556, and 1565. translates it, *Animabus vestris purificatis obediendo veritati per Spiritum*: which another of *Queen Elizabeth's* Bibles render thus, *Seeing your Souls are purified in obeying the Truth, through the Spirit.* So translates also the English Bible, Printed at *Geneva*, 1561. and the Scotch, Printed at *Edenborough*, 1579.

So that these words make nothing at all either for *Free will*, or *Co-operation* with GOD's Grace, or Value of Good Works, but rather the contrary; proving that in our Justification we work not, but are Wrought; we purifie not our selves, but are Purified; we are not Active and Doers with GOD's Grace, but Passive and Sufferers: Which Opinion the Council of *Trent* condemns. The Protestant Bible of 1683. has again Corrected this, and translates, *Seeing ye have purified your Souls*, &c. but whether with any good and sincere Intention, appears by their having left uncorrected another Fault of the same stamp in *Philippians*, cap. 1. ver. 28.

Where *St. Paul*, handling the same Argument, Exhorts the Christians not to fear the Enemies of *Christ*, tho' they Persecute never so terribly, *Which to them (says he) is cause of Perdition, but to you of Salvation*: where he makes Good Works necessary, and so the Causes of Salvation, as Sins are of Damnation. But *Beza* will have the Old Interpreter over-seen in so translating, *Because (says he) the Affliction of the Faithful is never call'd the Cause of their Salvation, but the Testimony*: And therefore translates the Greek Word, *ἔσθ' ἔτι, Indicium*. And his Scholars, the English Translators, render it a Token, tho' indeed one of their Testaments translate it as we do,

Lut. To. 2. Wissem. An. 1551. Affer. A. 1. 36. Vid. de Servo. Arbit. fol. 195. Edit. 1603. Zuing. To. 10. de Providencia Dei fol. 365, 366, 367. Calvin Instit. l. 1. c. 18. & l. 2. c. 4. and l. 3. c. 23.

Vid. Litteras Senat. Bern. ad Ministros, &c. An. 1555. Dr. Ten. Conf. with M. P.

Castificantes animas vestras in obedientia. Charitatis.

Bib. 1561. 1579.

Sect. 6. cap. 4.

Beza Aunos. in illum locum.

Bib. 1561. a Cause; so does also *Erasmus*, and the *Tigurine* Translator: Yea, the Apostles comparing Sins with Good Works, these leading to Heaven, as those to Hell, convinces its Sense to be so; as *Theodore* a Greek Father, also gathers from that Word; saying, *That procures to them Destruction, but to you Salvation.* So *St. Augustin*, *St. Hierom*, and other *Latin* Fathers.

Theod. in Phil. cap. 1.

Beza Test. Anno 1565. Bib. 1683.

And that Good Works are a cause of Salvation, our Saviour himself clearly shews, when He thus speaks of *Mary Magdalen*, *Remittuntur ei peccata multa, quoniam dilexit multum*; *Many Sins are forgiven her, because she loved much.* Against which no Man living can cavil from the *Greek*, *Hebrew*, or *Latin*, but that Works of Charity are a Cause why Sins are Forgiven; and so a Cause of our Justification and Salvation, which is evidently the Words and Meaning of our Blessed Saviour. Notwithstanding, *Beza* and our *English* Translators have a shift for this also; he translates, *Remissa sunt peccata ejus multa. Nam dilexit multum*; which in our *English* Bible is render'd, *Her Sins which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much*: which the Reader perhaps may think to be a Difference so small, as is not worth taking notice of; but, if well consider'd, will be found as great, as is between *Our* Doctrine and *Protestants*. And first, The Text is Corrupted by making a fuller Point than either the *Greek* or *Latin* bears, the *English* making some a Colon, (:) and some a Semicolon, (;) where in *Greek* there is only a Comma, (,) and *Beza*, in his *Latin*, yet more desperately makes a down and full Period, (.) thereby dividing and distracting the latter part from the former; as tho' it contain'd not a reason of that which went before, as it does, but were some new Matter: wherein he is controul'd by another of his own Translators, and by the *Greek* Prints of *Geneva*, *Zurick*, *Basil*, and other *German* Cities, who point it as it is in our *Latin* and *English*. — But their Falshood appears much more in turning [*Quoniam*] into [*Nam*], *Because* into *For*.

1556.

Seeing our Saviours words are in effect thus, [*Because she loved much, therefore many Sins are forgiven her*]; which they, by this Perversion and Mispointing it, make a quite different, and almost contrary Sense; thus, [*Because she had many Sins forgiven her, therefore she loveth much*]; and this Love following was a Token of the Remission, which she, by *Only Faith*, had obtain'd before; so turning the Cause into the Effect, and the Antecedent into the Consequent, hereby utterly overthrowing the Doctrine, which *CHRIST* by his Words and Reason gives, and the Church of his Words and Reason gathers. *Beza* blushes not to confess, why he thus alter'd *CHRIST*'s words: saying, '*Nam dilexit, id est, propter* For she loved: The Vulgar Translation and *Erasmus* turn it, [*Because she loved*]; But I (*says he*) had rather Interpret it as I do, that Men may best understand in these words to be shew'd, not the cause of Remission of Sins, but rather that which ensu'd after such Remission, and that by the Consequent is gather'd the Antecedent. And therefore, they who abuse this place, to overthrow *Free Justification* by *Only Faith*, are very Impudent and Childish: Thus *Beza*. But the Ancient Fathers, who were neither Impudent nor Childish, gather'd from this Text, that *CHARITY*, as well as *FAITH*, is requisite for the obtaining Remission of Sins. *St. Chrysostome*, Hom. 6. in *Mat.* says, 'As first by Water and the Spirit, so afterward, by Tears and Confession, we are made clean: which he proves by this place. So *St. Gregory*, expounding this same place, says, 'Many Sins are forgiven her, because she loved much; as if it had been said expressly, He burns out perfectly the rust of Sin, who soever burns vehemently with the Fire of Love. For so much more is the Rust of Sin scour'd away, by how much more the Heart of a Sinner is inflam'd with the great Fire of Charity.

Beza in Luc. 7. ver. 47.

Hom. 33. in Evang.

And *St. Ambrose* upon the same words. — 'Good are Tears, which are able to wash away our Sins. Good are Tears, wherein is not only the Redemption of Sinners, but also the refreshing of the Just.

Hom. 23 inter 50.

And the Great *St. Augustin*, debating this Story in a long Homily, says; 'This Sinful Woman, the more she Ow'd, the more she Lov'd; the Forgiver of her Debts, our Lord himself, affirming so: Many Sins are forgiven her, because she loved much. And why Loved she much, but because she Owed much? Why did she all these Offices (of Weeping, Washing, &c.) but to obtain Remission of her Sins? Other Holy Fathers agree in the self-same Verity, all making her Love to be a Cause going before, not only an Effect or Sequel coming after the Remission of Sins.

I have only taken notice here, how *Beza*, and our *English* Translators have Corrupted this Text; but he, who pleases to read *Aluscalius*, in *locis Communibus*, c. de *Justificatione*. 11. 5. will find him perverting it after another strange manner, by boldly asserting, without all reason or probable conjecture, That our Blessed Saviour spoke in *Hebrew*, and us'd the *Præterperfectum* for the

Present

Present Tense; and that St. Luke writ in the *Dorical Dialect*; so that *Musculus* would have it said, *She Loved CHRIST much, and no wonder; she had good Cause so to do, because many Sins were forgiven her.*

But *Zuinglius* goes yet another way to work with this Text, and tells us, That he supposes the word [*Love*] should have been [*Faith*]; His words are, — 'Because she loved much. I suppose, that *Love* is here put for *Faith*; Because she has so great affiance in me, so many Sins are forgiven her. For he says afterwards, *Thy Faith* hath saved thee; that is, has deliver'd and absolv'd thee from thy Sins. — Which one distinction of his, will Answer all the Places that in this Controversie can be brought out of Scripture to refel their *Only Faith*. But, to conclude, What can be more Impious, than to affirm, That for obtaining Remission of Sins, *Charity* is not requir'd as well as *Faith*, seeing our Blessed Saviour, in this place, (if we'll credit his Evangelist St. Luke, and I think his Authority ought to be preferr'd before that of *Zuinglius*, *Beza*, *Musculus*, or our *English* Sectaries) most divinely conjoyns *Charity* with *Faith*, saying of *Charity*, *Many Sins are forgiven her, because she Loved much?* Straight-way adding (of *Faith*), *Thy Faith has made thee safe; go in Peace.*

*Zuing. in
Luc. 7. Zo. 4.*

As you see here, they use all their endeavours to suppress the necessity of Good and Charitable Works; so, on the other side, they endeavour'd to make their first Bibles countenance Vice, so far as to seem to allow of the detestable Sin of *Usury*, so it were not hurtful to the Borrower. In *Deuteronomy* 23. ver. 19. they translate thus, *Thou shalt not hurt thy Brother by Usury of Money, nor by Usury of Corn, nor by Usury of any thing that he may be hurt withal*: By which they would have it meant, that *Usury* is not here forbidden, unless it hurt the Party that Borrowes. A Conceit so rooted in most Mens Hearts, that they think such *Usury* very Lawful, and therefore frequently Offend therein. But Almighty GOD, in this place of Holy Scripture, has not one word of *Hurting*, or *not Hurting*, as may be seen in the *Hebrew* and *Greek*; and as also appears from their having Corrected the same in their Bible of 1683. where they read, (as it ought to be) *Thou shalt not lend upon Usury to thy Brother, Usury of Money, Usury of Viduals, Usury of any thing that is lent upon Usury.* — If the *Hebrew* Word signifie to Hurt by *Usury*, why did not they in the very next words following, in the self-same Bibles, translate it thus, *Unto a Stranger thou may'st lend upon Usury, but not unto thy Brother?* Why said they not rather, *A Stranger thou may'st hurt by Usury, but not thy Brother?* Is it not all one Word and Phrase here and before? The *Jews* would have given them Thanks for so translating; who, by forcing the *Hebrew* Word as They do, think it well done, to hurt any Stranger, that is, any Christian, by *Usury*, be it never so great.

*Bib. 1562,
1577.*

Whether the first Protestant Translators of the Scriptures were guided by that Spirit, which should be in *Christian Catholick* Translators, may be easily gather'd from what follows, as well as from what you have already seen.

They were so Prophane and Dissolute, that some of them term'd that Divine Book call'd, *Canticum Canticorum*, containing the high Mystery of *CHRIST*, and his Church, *The Ballet of Ballers* of Solomon, as if it were a *Ballet* of Love, between *Solomon* and his *Concubine*, as *Castilio* wantonly translated it.

And yet more prophanely, in another place, which even their last Translation has not yet vouchsafed to Correct, [*We have Conceived, we have born in Pain, as tho' we should have brought forth Wind.*] I am asham'd to set down the littler Commentary of this their Translation: Was there any thing in the *Hebrew* to hinder them from Translating it in this manner, *We have Conceived, and as it were Travelled to bring forth, and have brought forth the Spirit?* Why should they say *Wind* rather than *Spirit*? They are not Ignorant, that the *Septuagint* in *Greek*, and the Ancient Fathers, do all Expound it, according to both the *Hebrew* and *Greek*, of the Spirit of GOD, which is first Conceived in us, and begins by *Fear*, which the Scripture calls, *The beginning of Wisdom*: Inasmuch, that in the *Greek* there are these Godly words, Famous in all Antiquity. — *Through the Fear of thee, O Lord, we Conceived, and have Travelled with Pain, and have brought forth the Spirit of thy Salvation, which thou hast made upon the Earth*: which excellently sets before our Eyes the degrees of a Faithful Man's Increase, and proceeding in the Spirit of GOD. But to say, *We have been with Child*, (as their last Translation has it) and have brought forth *Wind*, can admit no Spiritual Interpretation; but even as a mere Jew should translate or understand it, who has no sense of the Spirit of GOD. It is the custom of Protestants, in all

*Esaiah c. 16,
ver. 18.*

*St. Ambrose.
lib. 2. de In-
terpret. c. 4.
Chrysostome,
in Psal. 7.
prop. fin.
Sec S. Hierom
upon this
place.
Bib. 1683.*

such cases as this, where the richer Sense is of GOD's Holy Spirit, there to translate *Wind*, as in *Psal.* 147. ver. 18.

It is not unlike to this, that they will not translate for the Angel's Honor that carried *Abacuc*, *He set him into Babylon, over the Lake, by the force of his Spirit*; but thus, *Through a Mighty Wind*: So attributing it to the Wind, not to the Angels Power, and omitting quite the Greek Word [*αὐτῷ*] *Hu*, which sheweth plainly, that it was the Angel's Spirit, Force, and Power.

Again, where the Prophet *Isaiah* speaks most manifestly of *CHRIST*, saying, *And (our Lord) shall not cause thy Doctor to fly from thee any more, and thine Eyes shall see thy Master*; (which is all one in effect with that which *CHRIST* says, *I will be with you unto the end of the World*) there one of their Bibles translates thus, *Thy Rain shall be no more kept back, but thine Eyes shall see thy Rain*. Their last Translation has Corrected this mad Falsification.

Again, where the Holy Church reads, [*Rejoice, ye Children of Sion, in the Lord your GOD, because he has given you the Doctor of Justice*]; there one of their Translations has it, *The Rain of Righteousness*: And their last Bible, instead of Correcting the former, makes it yet worse, (if it can be made worse) saying, *Be glad then, ye Children of Sion, &c. for he hath given you the former Rain moderately*. Does the Hebrew Word force them to this? Doubtless they cannot but know, that it signifies a Teacher or Master: And therefore, even the Jews themselves, partly understand it of *Esdra*, partly of *Christ's* Divinity: Yet these New and Partial Translators are resolv'd to be more Prophane than the very Jews. If they had (as I hinted above) been guided by a Catholic and Christian Spirit, they might have been satisfy'd with the Sense of St. Hierom, a Christian Doctor, upon these places, who makes no doubt but the Hebrew is Doctor, Master, Teacher; who also in the Psalm translates thus, [*Wish Blessings shall the Doctor be Arrayed*], meaning *CHRIST*; Where Protestants (with the Jews of latter days, the Enemies of *CHRIST*) translate, *The Rain covers the Pools*. What cold stuff is this, in respect of that other Translation, so clearly pointing to *CHRIST* our Doctor, Master, and Lawgiver.

And again, where St. Jerom, and all the Fathers translate and expound, *There shall be Faith in thy Times*, to express the wonderful Faith that shall be among Christians; there they translate, *There shall be Stability of thy Times*. And their last Bible has it thus, *And Wisdom and Knowledge shall be the Stability of thy Times*: Whereas the Prophet reckons all these Vertues singly, viz. Judgment, Justice, (which they term Righteousness) Faith, Wisdom, Knowledge, and the Fear of our Lord; but they, for a little Ambiguity of the Hebrew Word, turn Faith into Stability.

In *Isai.* 37. ver. 22. All their first Bibles read, — *O Virgin Daughter of Sion, he hath despised thee, and laugh'd thee to scorn: O Daughter of Jerusalem, he hath shaken his Head at thee*. In the Hebrew, Greek, St. Hierom's Translation and Commentary, as also in the Protestant last Bible, Printed 1683. it is quite contrary, viz. *The Virgin Daughter of Sion has despised thee*, [*O Assur*:] *The Daughter of Jerusalem has shaken her Head at thee*. All are the Feminine Gender, and spoken of *Sion*, literally triumphing over *Assur*; and of the Church, Spiritually triumphing over Heresies, and all her Enemies. In their first Bibles, they translated all as of the Masculine Gender, thereby applying it to *Assur*; insulting against *Sion* and *Jerusalem*. But for what cause or reason they thus falsify it, will be hard to determine, unless they dreaded, that by translating it otherwise it might be applyed Spiritually to the Church's Triumphing over Themselves, as Her Enemies. We cannot judge it an over-sight in them, because we find it so translated in the Fourth Book of *Kings*, cap. 19. ver. 21. yea, and in all their first Translations.

A great many other Faults are found in their first Translations, which might be pass'd by, as not done upon any ill design, but perhaps rather as Mistakes or Over-sights: yet however, touching some few of them, 'twill not be a mis to demand a Reason, why they were committed: As for Example, why they translated, — [*Ye Abject of the Gentiles*, *Isai.* 45. ver. 20.] rather than, *Ye, who are saved of the Gentiles*; or, as their last Translation has it, *Ye, that are escaped of the Nations*? Or,

Why in their Bible of 1579. did they write, at length, [*Two Thousand to them that keep the Fruit thereof*], rather than, *Two Hundred*; as it is in the Hebrew and Greek, and as now their last Bible has it? Or,

Why read they in some of their Bibles, — [*As the Fruits of Cedar*, and not rather according to the Greek and Hebrew, *Tabernacles of Cedar*; or however, as their last Translation has it, *Tents of Cedar*? Or,

Why

Isai. 30. v. 20.

Joel 2. v. 13.

Lyr. in 30.
Isai.

Psal. 84.
ver. 7.

Isai. 33.
ver. 6.

Cantic.
Canticor.
c. 8. ver. 12.

Cantic.
Canticor.
c. 1. ver. 4.
Isai. 7. v. 11.

Why translate they, — [Ask a Sign, either in the depth, or in the height above,] rather than, *Ask a Sign, either in the depth of Hell, &c.* as the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin has it? Or,

Isai. 7. v. 11.

Why do they translate, [To make ready an Horse] rather than *Beasts*, as the Greek has it; and as also now their Edition of 1683 reads it? Or,

Acts 13. v. 24.

Why translate they, [If a Man on the Sabbath-Day receive Circumcision, without breaking the Law of Moyses,] rather than according to the Greek, which their last Translation has follow'd. If a Man on the Sabbath-Day receive Circumcision, so the end the Law of Moyses should not be broken? Or,

Jo: 7. v. 23.

Why read they, — [The Son of Adam must suffer many things, and be reprov'd of the Elders,] for, *be reprov'd of the Elders*, as the Greek, and now their Bible of 1683. have it; and as in the Psalm, *The Stone which the Builders reprov'd*; we say not, *reprov'd of the said Stone*, which is CHRIST?

Mark 8. v. 31.

Again, Why translate they thus, [Many which had seen the first House, when the Foundations of this House was laid before their Eyes, wept, &c.] when in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, 'tis read thus: *Many who had seen the first House in the Foundation thereof*, (i. e. yet standing upon the Foundation, undestroyed) *and this Temple before their Eyes, wept?* I suppose they imagin'd, that it should be meant they saw Solomon's Temple when 'twas first Founded; which, because 'twas impossible, they translated otherwise than 'tis in the Hebrew and Greek; they should indeed have consider'd better of it.

Tho' we do not look upon several of these, as done (I say) with any ill design; yet we cannot excuse them of being done with much more *Licentious Boldness*, than ought to appear in sincere and honest Translators.

Absurdities in turning Psalms into Metre.

Their unrestrain'd Licentiousness is yet further manifest, in their turning of *David's Psalms* into *Rhyme* (without reason,) and then Singing them in their Congregations; telling the People (from St. James, cap. 5.) *If any be Merry, let him Sing Psalms*; being resolv'd to do nothing but what they produce a Text of Scripture for, tho' of their own Making: For, tho' the Apostle Exhorts *Such as are Heavy, to Pray*; and, *Such as are Merry, to Sing*; yet he does not in particular appoint *David's Psalms* to be Sung by the Merry, no more than he appoints our *Lord's Prayer* to be said by such as he Exhorts to Pray, (tho' perhaps he meant it of both:) So that for any thing our bold Interpreters can gather from the Text, [*Æquo animo est? Psallat.* *ἰσχυρότερον.*] St. James might mean other Spiritual Songs and Hymns, as well as *David's Psalms*: But be it that he exhorted them to Sing *David's Psalms*, which we have no cause to deny, because the Church of Christ has ever us'd the same; yet, that he meant it of such Nonsensical Rhymes, as *T. Sternhold*, *Jo. Hopkins*, *Robert Wisdom*, and other Protestant Poets have made to be Sung in their Churches, under the name of *David's Psalms*, none can ever grant, who has read them. It has hitherto been the Practice of GOD's Church, to sing *David's Psalms*, as truly translated from the Hebrew into Latin; but never to sing such Songs as *Hopkins* and *Sternhold* have turn'd from the English Prose into Metre: Neither do I think, that Sober and Judicious Protestants themselves can look upon them as good Forms of Praises to be Sung in their Churches, to the Glory, Honour, and Service of so Great, so Good, and so Wise a GOD, when they shall consider how full they are fraught with *Nonsense*, and *ridiculous Absurdities*, besides many *gross Corruptions*, (*viz.* above Two Hundred *, confest by Protestants themselves to be found in the Psalms in Prose, from which these were turn'd into Metre, which we may guess are scarce Corrected by the Rhyme:) To Collect all the Faults committed by the said Blessed Poets in their Psalm-Metre, would be a Task too tedious for my design'd Brevity: I will therefore only set down some few of their *Absurd* and *Ridiculous* Expressions; and for the rest, leave the Reader to compare these Psalms in Metre with the other in Prose, even as by Themselves Translated.

* See the Preface.

PSALM
and
VERSE.PSALMS in Prose,
Bible 1683.PSALMS in Metre,
Bible 1683.

ii. ver. 3.

*Let us break their bands
asunder, and cast away their
Cords from us.*

Shall we be bound to them, say they,
Let all their Bonds be broke,
And of their Doctrine and their Law,
Let us reject the Toke.

xvi. v. 9, 10.

*Therefore my Heart is
Glad, and my Glory rejoyceth:
My Flesh also shall rest in hope.
For thou wilt not leave my
Soul in Hell, &c.*

Wherefore my Heart and Tongue also,
Do both rejoyce together;
My Flesh and Body rest in hope,
When I this thing consider.
Thou wilt not leave my Soul in Grave,
For Lord thou lovest me, &c.

xviii. v. 36.

*Thou hast enlarged my steps
under me, that my Feet did
not slip.*

And under me thou makest plain
The Way where I should walk:
So that my Feet shall never slip,
Nor stumble at a Balk.

lb. v. 37.

*I have pursued mine Ene-
mies, and overtaken them:
Neither did I turn again till
they were consumed.*

So I suppress and wound my Foes,
That they can rise no more:
For at my Feet they fall down flat,
I strike them all so fore.

xxii. v. 7.

*All they that see me, laugh
me to scorn. They shoot out
the Lip, they shake the Head.*

All Men despise, as they behold
me walking on the way: (&c.
They Grin, they Mow, they Nod their heads

lb. v. 12.

*Many Bulls have compassed
me, strong Bulls of Basan have
beset me round.*

So many Bulls do compass me,
That be full strong of Head:
Yea, Bulls so fat, as tho' they had
In Basan Field been fed.

xxvi. v. 10.

*In whose hand is Mischief,
and their Right-hand is full of
Bribes.*

Whose hands are heapt with Craft & Guile
Their Lives thereof are full.
And their Right-hand with wretch & wile,
For Bribes doth pluck and pull.

xlix. v. 20.

*Man that is in Honour, and
understandeth not, is like the
Beasts that Perish.*

Thus Man to Honor God hath brought,
Yet doth he not consider;
But like brute Beast, so doth he live,
And turn to Dust and Powder.

lxxiv. v. 11,
& 12.

*Why withdraweth thou thy
hand, even thy Right-hand?
Pluck it out of thy Bosom.*

Why dost thou draw thy hand a back,
And hide it in thy Lap?
O pluck it out, and be not slack,
To give thy Foes a rap.

*The Reader need not
be told why this is ad-
ded, besides its making
up the Rhyme.*

*What they translate
Glory in Prose, they
call Tongue in Rhyme.
And for want of one
Foot to make up another
Verse, they thrust in a
whole Body, [Flesh and
Body.] Again, what
in Prose is call'd Hell,
in Rhyme they term
Grave: as if Souls
were left in the Grave.*

*This Warrior lays
about him at another
kind of rate than Da-
vid did,*

*We have heard of Craf-
ty Heads, but never of
Crafty Hands.*

*In the Title Page they
say, [If any be Merry,
let him Sing Psalms.]
But considering what
Psalms they are, they
advise him to Sing, they
might have done as well
to have said rather, [If
any WOULD be Mer-
ry, let him Sing Psalms]*

PSALM
and
VERSE.

PSALMS in Prose.
Bible 1683.

PSALMS in Metre,
Bible 1683.

lxxviii.v.16

--- He caused Waters to
run down like Rivers.

---Of such abundance, that no Floods
to them might be compared.

lxxviii.v.57

--- They were turned aside
like a deceitful Bow.

--- They went astray,
Much like a Bow that would not bend,
But slip and start away.

lxxxix.v.46.

The days of his Youth hast
thou shortened: Thou hast co-
vered him with shame. Selah.

Thou hast cut off, and made full short
His Youth and lusty days;
And rais'd of him an ill report,
With shame and great dispraise.

To say that GOD
raises an ill report of
Men, has affinity to
Beza's Doctrine, which
makes God the Author
of Sin. Vid. Supr.

xcvii.v.12.

Light is sown for the Right-
eous, and gladness to the up-
right in Heart.

And Light doth spring up to the Just,
With Pleasure for his part, (&c.
Great Joy with Gladness, Mirth and Lust,

I thought, till now,
that Lust had been a
Sin.

xcix. v. 1.

The Lord reigneth, let the
People tremble; he sitteth be-
tween the Cherubims, let the
Earth be moved.

The Lord doth Reign, although at it
The People rage full sore:
Yea he on Cherubims doth sit,
Tho' all the World do rore.

cxix. v. 70.

Their Heart is as fat as
Grease: [As Fat as Brawn,
in another Bible. But in the
Lat. Vulgat. Coagulum
est sicut lac cor eorum.]

Their Hearts are swoln with worldly
As Grease so are they fat. (Wealth,

Ib. v. 83.

For I am become like a Bot-
tle in the Smoak.

As a Skin-Bottle in the Smoak,
So am I parch'd and dry'd.

Ib. v. 110.

The Wicked have laid a
Snare for me.

Although the wicked laid their Nets,
To catch me at a Bay.

Ib. v. 130.

The entrance of thy Word
giveth Light: it giveth Un-
derstanding unto the Simple.

When Men first enter into thy Word,
They find a Light most clear;
And very Idiots understand,
When they it read or hear.

By singing thus, they
would poss'ss the People
that even the most Ignor-
ant of them are capable
to understand the Scrip-
ture when they read it,
or have it read to them.

PSALM
and
VERSE.PSALMS in Prose,
Bible 1683.PSALMS in Metre,
Bible 1683.

Ib. v. 150.

*They draw nigh that follow
after Mischief: they are far
from thy Law.*

*My Foes draw near, and do procure
My Death maliciously.*

*Which from thy Law are far gone back,
And stray'd from it lewdly.*

CXX. v. 5.

*Woe is me, that I sojourn in
Mesekh, that I dwell in the
Tents of Kedar.*

*Alas! too long I slack,
Within these Tents so black,
Which Kedars are by Name;
By whom the Flock Elest,
And all of Isaac's Sect,
Are put to open shame.*

*Why is all this added?
only for the sake of
Rhyming to the Word
[Name,] unless they
would make Isaac a
Sect-Master, and his
Religion a Sect like
their own.*

CXXVII. v. 2.

*It is in vain for you to rise
up early, to sit up late, to eat
the bread of Sorrow.*

*Though ye rise early in the Morn,
And so at Night go late to Bed,
Feeding full hardy with brown Bread,
Yet were your labour lost and worn.*

*If brown Bread is
the Bread of Affliction,
a great many Feeds of
it that are able to buy
White.*

CXXIX. v. 6.

*Let them be as Grass upon
the House-Tops, which wither-
eth afore it groweth up.*

*And made as Grass upon the House,
Which withereth ere it grow.*

*How Grass can wi-
ther before it grows, is
a Paradox.*

I could weary the Reader with such like Examples: They seldom or never speak of GOD's Covenant with Israel, but they call it GOD's Trade. As in Psalm lxxviii. ver. 10. where they Sing,

*For why? they did not keep with GOD, the Covenant that was made;
Nor yet would walk or lead their lives, according to his Trade.*

And in ver. 37.

For why? their Hearts were nothing bent to Him, nor to his Trade.

Again,

LXXXI. v. 4.

For this is unto Israel a Statute and a Trade,

LXXXIX. 32.

And set all my Commandments light, and will not keep my Trade.

CXLVIII. v. 6.

To them he made a Law and Trade, &c.

*Perhaps this word
Trade should have
been Tradition with
them; but for fear
of a Popish Term,
which they so much
dread, they had rather
write Nonsense, than
use it.*

Such stuff as this you'll find in other places. The words [More and Less] has also stood them in as good stead as [Trade] to make Rhyme with, viz.

CXXIII. v. 8.

All Men on Earth, both least and most.

CXLVIII. v. 11

All Kings, both more and less.

Ib. v. 14.

The Children of Israel, each one both more and less.

See Psalm

CXXIX. v. 10.

vi. v. 6.

CXXVII. v. 8.

*Nor are they a little beholding to an Ever and For Aye. For ever and a day. For evermore
always, and the like.*

Besides

Besides their turning the *Psalm* into *Metre*, they also made Rhyme of the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Creed*, and the *Ten Commandments*. In which One thing is remarkable, viz. That in the *Creed*, upon the Article of *CHRIST's* Descent into *Hell*, they make a very plain distinction between the *Hell* of the *Damned*, and *that* of the *Fathers* of the *Old Testament*, [*Limbus Patrum*,] thus :

*And so be Died in the Flesh, but Quickned in the Sprite,
His Body then was Buried, as is our Use and Right.
His Soul did after this descend into the Lower Parts,
A dread unto the wicked Spirits, but joy to faithful Hearts.*

Whom do they mean by those *Faithful Hearts*, to whom our Blessed Saviours descent into *Hell* [*Limbus*] was a Joy, but those, of whom the Prophet *Zachary* spake, when Prophecying of our Saviours releasing them, he said, *Thou also in the Blood of thy Testament hast let forth thy Prisoners out of the Lake, wherein there is no Water.* And, whom *St. Peter* meant, when he said, that *CHRIST* in Spirit Coming, Preached to the Spirits also that were in Prison: which had been Incredulous sometimes, when they expected the Patience of *GOD* in the days of *Noc*, when the *Ark* was in Building.

Zac. 9. 11.

The turning of this Article into *Metre* is, I suppose, the very cause why we have not the *Creed* Printed in *Metre* in their latter Impressions; and consequently, none of the other Prayers and Rhymes, which their first Bibles had after the *Psalm*; because to put out this and no more, would have given too shrewd a cause of suspicion.

Besides the turning of these into *Metre*, they made also certain other Prayers of their own in Rhyme; in one of which they rank the *Pope*, (whom their Modern Divines count a *Great Bishop*, and *Chief Patriarch* of the *Western Church*, and from whom they pretend to receive their *Episcopal* and *Priestly Character*) in the same List with the *Turk*, as if both were *Infidels* alike, and both alike Enemies to *CHRIST*. *Robert Wisdom* thus sets out his *Psalms*, (which the Ignorant People may be apt to take for one of *David's*; assuring themselves, that *David* himself Pray'd to be deliver'd from *Turk* and *Pope*, and consequently, that the *Pope* is a dangerous Creature.)

R. W.

*Preserve us Lord, by thy dear Word,
From TURK and POPE defend us Lord,
Which both would thrust out of his Throne,
Our Lord Jesus CHRIST, thy dear Son.*

But this, with other such like stuff, is also left out by *Protestants* in their last Impressions, as being indeed asham'd of the *Impiety*, *Malice*, and *Folly* of these gross *Impostors*, especially of this *Robert Wisdom*, who (notwithstanding his Name) was doubtless the most Ignorant of all those who ever undertook to turn *Psalms* into *Metre*. And so 'tis likely he was look'd upon by *Dr. Corbet*, sometime *Bishop* of *Norwich*, when he made this following Address to his Ghost.

To the Ghost of R. Wisdom.

*Thou once a Body, now but Air,
Arch-botcher of a Psalm or Prayer,
From Carfax* come,
And patch us up a Zealous Lay,
With an old Ever and for Aye,
Or All and some.*

*Or such a Spirit lend me,
As may an Hymn down send me,
To purge my Brain.
Then Robin look behind thee,
Lest Turk or Pope do find thee,
And go to Bed again.*

* The Place
of his Burial
in Oxford.

This may seem too Light for a Treatise of this Nature; but the ridiculous Absurdity of these Rhymes (the singing of which in Churches, has, by several Learned Protestants, been complain'd of and lamented, cannot be fully enough expos'd; that so (if possible) the common Peoples Eyes may be open'd, and they may be taken off from that Fondness, they seem to have for them.

Tho' rather the Ignorance than Ill-intention of these busie Poets appear in their Psalm-Metre; yet what follows cannot be excus'd from being done with a very Treacherous design of the Translators: For what can possibly be a more sly piece of Craft to deceive the Ignorant Reader, than to use *Catholick Terms* and *Speeches* in all such places where they may render them *Odious*, and when they must needs sound ill in the Peoples Ears? For Example, II Maccabees 6. ver. 7. this term *Procession*, they very Malitiously translate, saying, [*When the Feast of Bacchus was kept, they were constrain'd to go in Procession to Bacchus.*] Let the Reader see in the *Greek Lexicon*, if there be any thing in this word [*πομπήν τῷ δαίμονι*] like to the Catholick Churches Processions, or whether it signifie so much as to go about; as other of their Bibles translate it, with perhaps no less Ill-meaning than that of 1570. tho' they name not *Procession*.

Bib. 1562,
1577.

St. John cap. 9. ver. 22. and 25. where, for [*He should be put out of the Synagogue,*] their first Translations read, *He should be Excommunicated*, to make the Jews doings against them that confessed CHRIST sound like the Catholick Churches acting against Hereticks, in Excommunicating them; as if the Churches Excommunication of such, from the Society and Participation of the Faithful, were like to that Exterieur putting out of the *Synagogue*. And by this they design'd to disgrace the Priests Power of Excommunication, whereas the Jews had no such Spiritual Excommunication; but (as the Word only signifies) did put them out of the *Synagogue*; and so they should have translated, the *Greek Word* including the very Name *Synagogue*. But this Translation was made when the Excommunications of the Catholick Church were daily denounc'd against Them, which they have Corrected in their last Bible, because themselves have begun to assume such a Power of Excommunicating their Nonconformable Brethren.

In *Acts* 17. ver. 23. for, [*Seeing your Idols, or, Seeing the things which you Athenians did Worship,*] they translate, *Seeing your Devotions*, as tho' *Devotion* and *Superstition* were all one.

And ver. 24. for [*Temples of Diana,*] they translate, *Shrines of Diana*, to make the *Shrines of Saints Bodies*, and other *Holy Reliques*, seem *Odious*; whereas the *Greek Word* signifies *Temples*. And *Beza* says, *He cannot see how it can signifie Shrines*.

Thus they make use of *Catholick Words and Terms*, where they can possibly thereby render them *Odious*; but in other places, lest the *Ancient Words and Names* should still be retain'd, they change them into their own unaccustom'd and original Sound. So in the *Old Testament*, out of an Itch to shew their skill in the *Hebrew*, the first Translators thought fit to change most of the *Proper Names* from the usual Reading, never considering, how far differently *Proper Names* of all sorts are both writ and founded in differing Languages; but this is in a great part rectify'd by the last Translators, according to the Directions of King *James* the First, that in translating the *Proper Names*, they should retain the usual and accustom'd manner of Speaking.

Their altering of these *Proper Names* in the *Old Testament*, through the Pride of being esteem'd such knowing Masters in the *Hebrew*, was yet much more tolerable, than the changing many other words in the *New*, through an Heretical Intention of introducing an utter Oblivion of them among the People.

The words *Church, Bishop, Priest, Altar, Eucharist, Sacrifice, Grace, Sacrament, Baptism, Penance, Angel, Apostle, Christ, &c.* at their first Revolt, they suppress'd, and chang'd into *Congregation, Superintendent, Elder and Minister, Table, Thanksgiving, Gift, Mystery, Washing, Repentance, Messenger, Ambassador, Anointed*; several other Words and Phrases they likewise alter'd, as is evident from what goes before. And for what cause was all this change and alteration of *Catholick Terms and Phrases*, but that the sound of the Words should vanish with the substance of the Things, which they have taken away? With *Bishop* they banish'd the Pastoral Care and Charge of the *Pope*, and *Catholick Bishops*, and set up a Child and a Woman for the Heads of their *Congregation*. With *Priest* went away the Office of *Priest*, in Offering the Holy Sacrifice of *CHRIST's Body and Blood*: With *Grace* went away the Sacrament of *Holy Orders*, and four or five of the other Sacraments: With *Altar, Eucharist, and Sacrifice*, they excluded the proper Service of Almighty *GOD*, with *CHRIST's* Sacred Presence in the Blessed Sacrament: With the word *Penance*, they banish'd *Confession, Absolution, and Satisfaction for Sins*: They alter'd the word *Church*, because they had cut themselves off from the *Catholick Church*. And what other design could we suppose them to have had in leaving out *Apostles*, and putting in *Embassadors or Legates*; in leaving out *Angels*, and introducing *Messengers*; in putting down the word *Anointed*, where *CHRIST* use to be read; and in translating *Grave* for *Hell*; but in time to extinguish all Faith and Memory of *Apostle, Angel, Heaven, Hell, Christ* and *Christianity*, and to bring them to *Atheism* and *Infidelity*, the very center, to which their Reformation tends?

This Fantastical and Impious Vanity, in changing *Catholick and Christian Terms and Speeches* into their *Prophane and Heathenish Use and Signification*, was a thing so detested, even by *Beza* himself, (notwithstanding his being often guilty of the same) that he inveighs against it, and those who use it, in this manner, "The World is now come to that pass (*says he*) that not they only " who write their own Discourses, refuse the familiar and accustom'd Words of Scripture, as " obscure, unsavory, and out of use, but also those that translate the Scripture out of *Greek* into " *Latin*, challenge to themselves the like Liberty: So as whiles every Man will rather freely fol- " low his own Judgment than Religiously behave himself as the Holy Ghost's Interpreter, many " things they do not Convert, but Pervert: For which licentiousness and boldness, except Remedy be provided in time, either I am notably deceiv'd, or within few Years, instead of *Christians* " we shall become *Ciceronians* (i.e. *Pagans*) and by little and little shall lose the Possession of " the things themselves. By this you see, that the *Beza* was one of the greatest Masters in this Wanton, Novel, and Licentious Art of changing *Christian* for *Heathen Terms and Phrases*; Yet he foresaw that in the end, with the Words, would be taken away the Things signify'd, *Sacraments, Baptism, Eucharist, Priesthood, Sacrifice, Angels, Apostles, and all Apostolical Doctrine*: And that so we should be brought again from *Christianity* to *HEATHENISM*.

Change of Words induces change of Faith.

Beza in *Act.* c. 10. v. 46 Edit. Anno 1556. but in the later Edit of 1565. some of these words are alter'd either by himself or the Printer.

Dr. Stilling-
cheam of the
University, against
the Church of
Rome, pag. 7.
& pag. 40.

FROM WHICH, And from the STILLINGFLEETIAN
ERROR, that (by asserting, *The Pagan God Jupiter,
to be the True GOD, blessed for evermore*) throws open
the Door of *Jupiter's Temple*, and points out the
very Path-way to Paganism,

GOOD LORD DELIVER US

F I N I S

The Candid Reader is desir'd to Correct these following ERRATAS, before his
Perusal, especially those that are mark'd, *

Preface, pag. a. Marg. for 1085. read 1580. Pref. p. 6. l. 31. for * not found in one place, read
found not in one place. And line 34. for * though it agree, r. though it agree not. Pref. p. 11. l.
7. after the word Brethren, must be read, ^m As in behalf of their Character, they rectify'd [Ordain-
ing Elders by Election.] Pref. p. 12. l. 16. for Irreseruo r. Irreseruo. fol. 2. l. 23. for Unborn, Un-
form'd. In f. 35. Marg. for Let. Pat. Vrench. &c. read, K. Edw. VI. his Let. Pat. Jo. Ussellon. p.
17. Regist. Eccles. Perogr. Loudin. Calvin. p. 327. Resp. ad persecut. Aug. f. 57. l. 36. for Statues,
r. Statues. f. 83. l. 23. for For as yet, r. For not as yet.

